

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1402721



The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

Our Sacrifice of Praise and
Thanksgiving

49
5
6

Thesbury

“Our Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving”

OR,

“THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ON
THE LORD'S SUPPER COMPARED WITH SCRIPTURE
AND THE TEACHING OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH
AND ALSO WITH THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH
OF ROME.”

BY

THE REV. P. C. INGROUILLE, B.D.

(OF JESUS COLLEGE, OXFORD).

London :

CHAS. J. THYNNE,

GREAT QUEEN STREET, KINGSWAY, W.C.

November, 1909.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

TO THE MEMORY
OF
THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN CHARLES
RYLE, D.D.

(FIRST BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL)

TO WHOSE WRITINGS THE AUTHOR OF THIS BOOK
OWES SO MUCH, AND FROM WHOSE PORTRAIT, AS
IT HANGS IN THE EPISCOPAL PALACE AT LIVER-
POOL, HE HAS DERIVED MANY AN INSPIRATION,

THIS BOOK IS
RESPECTFULLY AND GRATEFULLY
DEDICATED.

"But what availeth it to take away beads, pardons, pilgrimages, and such like popery, so long as two chief roots remain unpulled up ? Whereof, so long as they remain, will spring again all former impediments of the Lord's harvest, and corruption of his flock. The rest is but branches and leaves, the cutting away whereof is but like topping and lopping of a tree, or cutting down of weeds, leaving the body standing and the roots in the ground; but the very body of the tree or rather the roots of the weeds, is the popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of the real presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the altar (as they call it), and of the sacrifice and oblation of Christ made by the priest, for the salvation of the quick and the dead. Which roots if they be suffered to grow in the Lord's vineyard, they will overspread all the ground again with the old errors and superstitions." (*Cranmer on "The True and Catholic Doctrine and use of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper "*) p. xxiv. (Thynne, 3/6 net).

PREFACE.

WE live in the day of crisis. Unless I am mistaken the day is not far distant when the Battle of the Reformation will have to be refought. Then, as in the 16th century—as even now, for the struggle may be said already to have commenced—the fight will rage the hottest around the Supper of the Lord.

That was the great battle-ground in the days of the Reformation. It is the great battle-ground still between the forces of truth and error.

In his book “Light from Old Times” (which should be read by every churchman and indeed every Englishman) the late Bishop J. C. Ryle wrote as follows :

“The principal reason why they (*i.e.*, the Reformers) were burned was because they refused one of the peculiar doctrines of the Romish Church. On that doctrine, in almost every case, hinged their life or death. If they admitted it, they might live ; if they refused it, they must die.”

“The doctrine in question was the *real presence* of the body and blood of Christ in the consecrated elements of bread and wine in the Lord’s Supper. Did they, or did they not believe that the body and blood of Christ were really, that is corporally, literally, locally and materially, present under the forms of bread and wine after the words of consecration were pronounced ? Did they or did they not believe that the real body of

Christ, which was born of the Virgin Mary, was present on the so-called altar so soon as the mystical words had passed the lips of the priest? Did they or did they not? That was the simple question. If they did not believe and admit it they were burned." ("Light from Old Times" Edit. 1902, page 40) (Thynne, 2/6 net), and the Bishop quotes with approval in the same place the words of Foxe, the Martyrologist, "The Mass was one of the principal causes why so much turmoil was made in the church, with the bloodshed of so many godly men."

To-day a large and influential body of men in our beloved Church of England are teaching a doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist which, as was pointed out by Bishop Jackson of London as far back as 1875, differs "but verbally, *if* verbally" from transubstantiation, and of which the late Lord Arthur Harvey, Bishop of Bath and Wells, said: "The difference between the doctrine of transubstantiation and that taught by the new school (*i.e.*, the Ritualists) is absolutely insignificant in the region of religion." (See for above and further testimonies to the same effect "Quousque," edited by Canon Christopher and J. C. Sharpe, Esq.)

This being the case, it becomes increasingly important that the people of England and especially every churchman and churchwoman of all classes and all ages, should know clearly what the doctrine of the Church of England on the Lord's Supper really is and how closely it agrees with the teaching alike of Scripture and of the Primitive Church, while on the other hand it is poles asunder from, and in the most diametrical opposition to, the teaching of the Church of Rome.

This book, the greater part of which formed recently the substance of a dissertation by the writer for an Oxford theological degree, is sent forth in the earnest hope that, with the blessing of Almighty God, it may be widely used—to the demolition of error and to the establishment of His truth.

The prayer of young King Edward the Sixth in 1553, every true English churchman should make his own to-day :

“ O Lord God, defend this realm from Papistry, and maintain Thy true religion.”

Such a prayer made now, unitedly, in faith, cannot be made in vain. “ O Lord, arise, help us, and deliver us for Thine honour.”

P. C. INGROUILLE, B.D.

BATH, *October, 1909.*

"They (i.e. the Papists) teach that Christ is in the bread and wine ; but *we* say, according to the truth, that he is in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine."

"They say that Christ is received in the mouth, and entereth in with the bread and wine ; *we* say, that he is received in the heart, and entereth in by faith."

"They say, that every man, good and evil, eateth the body of Christ ; *we* say that both do eat the sacramental bread and drink the wine, but none do eat the very body of Christ and drink his blood, but only they that be lively members of his body."

"They say that good men eat the body of Christ and drink his blood, only at that time when they receive the sacrament ; *we* say, that they eat, drink and feed of Christ continually, so long as they be members of his body."

(*Cranmer "Lord's Supper"*) p.p 98 & 99
(edit. Thynne).

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFATORY REMARKS	15
CHAPTER I	
"THE TEACHING OF HOLY SCRIPTURE."	
THE ACCOUNTS OF INSTITUTION	17
MEANING OF "THIS IS MY BODY," ETC.	20
MEANING OF "THIS DO"	26
MEANING OF <i>ἀνάμνησις</i> ("REMEMBRANCE")	28
CHAPTER I (Continued)	
INTERPRETATION OF i COR. x. 14-22	33
INTERPRETATION OF i COR. xi. 26-29	36
ALLUSIONS IN ACTS OF THE APOSTLES	39
MEANING OF HEBREWS xiii. 10	40
INTERPRETATION OF ST. JOHN vi.	41
SUMMARY OF NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING	44
CHAPTER II	
"THE TEACHING OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH."	
A. LITURGICAL.	
1. DIDACHE	46
2. JUSTIN MARTYR	50
3. CLEMENTINE LITURGY	54
4. LITURGY OF PALESTINE IN 4TH CENTURY	63
5. LITURGY OF ANTIOPH (ST. CHRYSOSTOM)	65
6. SYRIAN LITURGY 5TH TO 8TH CENTURY	67
7. BYZANTINE LITURGY BEFORE 7TH CENTURY	68
8. THE SO-CALLED "EARLY" LITURGIES	70
SUMMARY OF THE TEACHING OF THE EARLY LITURGIES	70
CHAPTER II (Continued)	
B. PATRISTIC.	
THE TEACHING OF THE FATHERS OF THE FIRST SIX CENTURIES	74
I. BREAD AND WINE STILL AFTER CONSECRATION	74
(1) ST. CHRYSOSTOM	75
(2) ST. AUGUSTINE	75
(3) THEODORET	75
(4) GELASIUS (480 A.D.)	76
(5) FACUNDUS OF HERMIANA	76
(6) TERTULLIAN	77
(7) EPHRCREM SYRUS	77
(8) EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA	77
ON THE NAME OF THE THING SIGNIFIED, SOMETIMES APPLIED TO THE SIGN	77
II. NO IDENTIFICATION OF SIGN AND THING SIGNIFIED	77
(1) ST. AUGUSTINE	78
(2) ORIGEN	78
(3) JEROME	78
III. INCORPORATION INTO CHRIST IS BY FAITH	79
(1) ST. AUGUSTINE	79
(2) ST. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA	79
(3) ST. CHRYSOSTOM	79

	PAGE
IV. INCORPORATION ALSO BY BAPTISM RIGHTLY RECEIVED	79
(1) ST. AUGUSTINE	79
(2) ST. CHRYSOSTOM	80
(3) FULGENTIUS	80
V. IDENTICAL LANGUAGE USED BOTH AS TO BAPTISM AND THE LORD'S SUPPER	80
(1) ST. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA	80
(2) ORIGEN	81
(3) ST. AUGUSTINE	81
VI. CHANGE OF EFFICACY AND USE ONLY	81
(1) ST. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA	81
(2) THEODORET	81
(3) GREGORY OF NYSSA	81
USE OF WORDS "TRANSMADE" (<i>μεταποιεῖσθαι</i>) AND "TRANS-ELEMENTING" (<i>μεταστοιχειοῦσθαι</i>) BY THE FATHERS	81
VII. (a) BODILY ABSENCE OF CHRIST FROM EARTH AND (b) CHARACTER OF RISEN BODY	82
(a) (1) ORIGEN ; (2) ST. AUGUSTINE ; (3) ST. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA	82
(4) ST. CHRYSOSTOM ; (5) ST. AMBROSE ; (6) LEO THE GREAT	83
(b) (1) ST. AUGUSTINE ; (2) VIGILIUS OF THAPSUS ; (3) FULGENTIUS	84
(4) THEODORET	85
VIII. ON FEEDING UPON CHRIST	85
(1) FULGENTIUS ; (2) JEROME	85
IX. NO ORAL MANDUCATION CONTEMPLATED	86
ST. AUGUSTINE	86
HOOKER ON THE TEACHING OF THE FATHERS	86
SUMMARY OF TEACHING OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH OF THE FIRST SIX CENTURIES	87

CHAPTER III

THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION	89
SKETCH OF ROMAN MASS	89
COMMENTS ON THE SERVICE OF THE MASS	101

CHAPTER III (*Continued*)

CANONS AND DECREES OF COUNCIL OF TRENTO	103
I. 13TH SESSION (1551) "CONCERNING THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST	103
(1) REAL PRESENCE	104
(2) REASON OF INSTITUTION	105
(3) EXCELLENCE ABOVE OTHER SACRAMENTS	105
(4) TRANSUBSTANTIATION	106
(5) OF WORSHIP AND VENERATION OF THE SACRAMENT	107
(6) RESERVATION	107
(7) PREPARATION	107
(8) USE OF	107
CANONS ON THE SUBJECT UNDER HEADING I.	108

CONTENTS--(*continued*)

	13
	PAGE
II. 21ST SESSION (1562) "CONCERNING COMMUNION IN ONE KIND" AND CANONS ON THIS POINT	110
III. 22ND SESSION (1562)	
CONCERNING SACRIFICE OF THE MASS	110
(1) OF INSTITUTION	110
(2) CONCERNING PROPITIATORY SACRIFICE	111
(3) OF CEREMONIES	112
CANONS ON THE SUBJECT UNDER HEADING III.	112
CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.	113
CATECHISM OF COUNCIL OF TRENTE	114
SUMMARY OF THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ROME	116
(a) POSITIVE	116
(b) NEGATIVE	122
CHAPTER IV	
"CHURCH OF ENGLAND TEACHING ON THE LORD'S SUPPER."	
SOURCES OF INFORMATION	124
ORDER OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER OR HOLY COMMUNION	125
(1) PREPARATORY PART	125
NON-COMMUNICATING ATTENDANCE	127
CONFESSOR OR CONSULTATION	129
(2) CENTRAL PART	134
(3) CONCLUDING PART	135
CONCLUDING RUBRICS	136
"BLACK RUBRIC" (HISTORY AND INTERPRE- TATION OF)	136
MEANING OF "SACRIFICE OF PRAISE AND THANKSGIVING"	140
COMMEMORATION OF DEPARTED	142
SOME MINOR BUT SIGNIFICANT POINTS	143
CHAPTER V	
SKETCH OF THE STAGES BY WHICH THE PRESENT DOCTRINAL STATE- MENTS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ON THE LORD'S SUPPER HAVE BEEN ARRIVED AT.	
1. ORDER OF COMMUNION (1548)	146
2. 1ST PRAYER BOOK (1549)	147
3. 2ND PRAYER BOOK (1552)	148
4. ELIZABETHAN PRAYER BOOK (1559)	150
5. REVISION OF 1662	153
6. THE ARTICLES AND THE CHANGES MADE IN THEM	153
CHAPTER VI	
THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AS GATHERED FROM HER AUTHORIZED FORMULARIES.	
(a) NEGATIVE TEACHING	158
(b) POSITIVE TEACHING	165
QUOTATIONS FROM REPRESENTATIVE CHURCHMEN	181
CHAPTER VII	
"COMPARISON OF TEACHING OF SCRIPTURE, OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH, OF THE CHURCH OF ROME AND OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND."	
ARRANGED IN PARALLEL COLUMNS	186
CONCLUDING REMARKS	200

“Seeing that many have set to their hands, and whetted their tools, to pluck up the weeds, and to cut down the tree of error, I, not knowing otherwise how to excuse myself at the last day, have in this book set to my hand and axe with the rest, to cut down this tree, and to pluck up the weeds and plants by the roots which our heavenly Father never planted, but were grafted and sown in his vineyard by his adversary the devil and antichrist his minister. The Lord grant that this my travail and labour in his vineyard be not in vain, but that it may prosper and bring forth fruits to his honour and glory! For when I see his vineyard overgrown with thorns, brambles, and weeds, I know that everlasting woe appertaineth unto me, if I hold my peace, and put not to my hands and tongue to labour in purging his vineyard.” (*Cranmer “Lord’s Supper”*) p. xxv. (Thynne).

These words of a great man in his Preface to his great work on “The Lord’s Supper,” the writer of the present book would, with all humility make his own.

PREFATORY REMARKS

INASMUCH as the Church of England so constantly refers to the Holy Scriptures as the basis of her creed and the touchstone of her teaching, and as the final court of appeal in matters of faith and doctrine (see Articles 6, 8, and 20) and also to a certain extent in questions of rites and ceremonies—to this extent I mean that, while “the Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith,” yet “it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God’s Word written” (Article 20)—it seems best to approach our subject by stating and investigating in the first place the teaching of Holy Scripture in reference to the subject before us, *i.e.*, the Lord’s Supper.

Having done this, it will, I think, be simpler to state next the teaching of the Primitive Church, as far as it can be gathered; and also the doctrine of the Church of Rome. Then to give an account of the teaching of the Church of England on the subject as derived from her authorized formularies, and finally to draw a comparison between the latter and the three former.

“Our Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving”

CHAPTER I

THE TEACHING OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

OF the Institution of the Lord's Supper (one of the earliest names of the sacred rite, 1 Cor. xi. 20) we have four accounts which fall into two types—the Mark-Matthew, and the Luke-Paul—as we shall see at once by placing the four accounts side by side.

They are found in St. Matthew xxvi. 26—30; St. Mark xiv. 22—26; St. Luke xxii. 15—20; and 1 Cor. xi. 23—26.

MATT.—And as they were eating Jesus took bread and blessed
MARK.—And as they were eating He took bread and when He had blessed
LUKE.—And He took bread and when He had given thanks
COR.—In the night in which He was betrayed the Lord Jesus took bread and when He had given thanks
MATT.—And brake it and gave to the disciples and said, Take, eat, this is my body
MARK.—He brake it and gave to them and said, Take ye, this is my body
LUKE.—He brake it and gave to them saying this is my body which is given for you
COR.—He brake it this is my body which is for you

MATT.—And He took a cup and gave thanks and gave to them saying, Drink ye all of it
MARK.—And He took a cup and when He had given thanks He gave to them and they all drank of it And He said unto them in like manner after supper, saying
LUKE.—And in like manner after supper, saying
the cup
COR.—And in like manner after supper, saying
the cup
MATT.—For this is (covenant) my blood of the covenant
MARK.—This is (covenant) my blood of the covenant
LUKE.—This cup is the new covenant in my blood
COR.—This cup is the new covenant in my blood
MATT.—Which is shed for many unto remission of sins
MARK.—Which is shed for many
LUKE.—Which is shed for you

COR.—This do as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me
MATT.—But I say unto you I will not . . . henceforth . . . drink of this fruit of the vine
MARK.—Verily I say unto you I will no . . . more . . . drink of this fruit of the vine
LUKE (verse 18).—For I say unto you I will not from henceforth drink of this fruit of the vine
COR.—
MATT.—Until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom
MARK.—Until that day when I drink it new . . . in . . . the Kingdom of God shall come
LUKE.—Until . . . the Kingdom of God shall come
COR.—*Adds*,—“For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye proclaim the Lord's death till He come.”

From these accounts it is clear that the Lord's Supper was instituted at the close of the Paschal meal of which our Lord had just partaken with His disciples on that evening of the night in which He was betrayed; that the elements used were, bread,—which our Lord took and after giving thanks brake and gave to His disciples with the words "Take, eat, this is My body which is given for you,"—and wine, which He gave to them saying : " Drink ye all of it, for this is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins ; " that both the bread and the wine were partaken of by the disciples at the express command of our Lord ; that our Lord bade His disciples " Do this in remembrance of Me ; " that the contents of the cup are called " the fruit of the vine " after what we call " consecration," just as in St. Paul's account, in adding a characteristic comment at its close, which some indeed suppose to be not the comment of the Apostle, but a continuation of the words of Jesus used at the Institution, the " bread " is still called " bread " after " consecration."

It may be noted here that the view that the words of 1 Cor. xi. 26 (" For as often as ye eat this bread, etc.") formed part of our Lord's words at the Institution of the Lord's Supper, certainly derives support from the fact that in the earliest complete Liturgy, the Clementine Liturgy (found in the Apostolical Constitutions) these words are quoted without break, in the recital of the words of Institution, thus " For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do shew My death till I come ; " showing that the writer (who wrote in the latter half of the 4th century) evidently believed them to be a portion of the words used by our Lord. It is true that this writer does not quote the words of Institution with exact precision e.g., he connects our Lord's words about the new covenant with the

delivery of the “bread” instead of as in the New Testament accounts, with the delivery of the cup; nevertheless his use of them in the above form is remarkable.

There are other references to the Lord’s Supper which must be considered, but before we take note of these it may be well to deal at once with various points in the accounts of the Institution which have given rise to controversy and diversities of interpretation.

The chief point of controversy has been the meaning of the words, “This is My body,” (“which is [given—broken] for you,” Luke and 1 Cor.) and “This is My blood of the covenant” (Matthew, Mark), or “This cup is the new covenant in My blood (Luke, 1 Cor.)

The point in dispute is, of course, the meaning of the word “is.”

The question whether our Lord spoke in Aramaic or in Greek need not really be considered, for even supposing the words to have been uttered in Aramaic and the copula “is” to have been consequently lacking in the original, the copula *must* nevertheless be supplied, and the moment this is done enquiry will arise as to its meaning. Moreover, not in Aramaic but in Greek, has Christ handed down these words of His to His Church. All four accounts have the *էστιν* of the bread and of the cup, and as has been well said: “The fact that Christ probably used a language in which the copula was not expressed, is no good reason for giving the minimum of meaning to the *էστιν* which is conspicuous in the Scriptures given to us by Him.” (Art. “Lord’s Supper” in Hastings D.B. vol. iii. p. 149a).

What then does the “is” mean? Does it identify the subject “this” (*i.e.*, obviously the “bread” which our Lord gave to His disciples) with the predicate “My body,” or does it not?

The grammar, it may be said at once, does not help us here. From a grammatical point of view the words might denote identity or they might not.

We shall best arrive at the meaning of these disputed words by a consideration of the circumstances and setting under which they were uttered.

There was, in the first place, a close connection between the Institution of the Lord's Supper and the Passover meal. The former was preceded, as we know, by the latter and it was at the close of the latter that the former was instituted by our Lord.

In the Passover Feast, before the unleavened bread was partaken of the presiding elder used words cast into a form of similar construction to those used by our Lord.

Addressing the guests he said : " This (*i.e.*, the unleavened bread) is the bread of affliction which our fathers ate when they came out of Egypt ; " obviously not intending to identify the bread then about to be partaken of with the actual bread used at the first Passover in Egypt, but clearly meaning, " This unleavened bread of which we are now about to partake *represents* the bread of affliction (or, is a *type* of the bread of affliction) which our fathers ate when they came out of Egypt."

When, from the Passover Feast we turn to the Institution of the Lord's Supper, we find our Lord saying, as he takes in His hands a piece of the Passover loaf, " This (bread) is my body which is given for you." Manifestly, He was adapting what we might call the old Paschal formula (to which reference has just been made) to His new feast, and meant, *not* " This bread is identical with My body " but " This bread *represents* (or, is a *type* of) My body," or quoting the words in their full and longer form. " This is My body which is given (or 'broken' 1 Cor. xi. 24) for you," the meaning

would be : “ This bread which I have just broken is a figurative representation of My body broken or bruised upon the Cross for you.”

This method of speaking recurs constantly in the New Testament and was perfectly familiar to our Lord’s disciples. For example in St. Matthew xiii. we have our Lord saying (Parable of the Tares) “ The field *is* the world. The good seed *are* the children of the kingdom, but the tares *are* the children of the wicked one. The enemy that sowed them is the Devil ; the harvest *is* the end of the world, and the reapers are the angels,” where in each case the copula = “ represents.”

Similarly in the Epistles. In Galatians iv. 25 we have “ This Agar *is* (represents) Mount Sinai in Arabia ; ” in 1 Cor. x. 4, “ That Rock *was* (represented) Christ.”

And in the Apocalypse the usage is the same ; thus Rev. i. 20, “ The seven stars *are* (represent) the angels of the seven churches ; ” Rev. iv. 5, “ Seven lamps which *are* (represent) the seven spirits of God,” and Rev. v. 8, “ Vials full of odours which *are* (represent) the prayers of the saints.”

It is quite clear, I think, that it is in this sense that our Lord would have been understood by His disciples.

The analogy of the Passover and the current usage of the day alike point in the same direction.

It may be noted here that while rejecting the interpretation of the words which would take them to denote what has been called “ a physical identity ” they have been taken as denoting what, by contrast, has been called “ *spiritual* identity,” *i.e.*, as Canon Meyrick interprets them in his “ Doctrine of the Holy Communion ” (p. 112), as being equivalent to “ This is in effect My body,” “ This is in power and in efficacy My body.”

Edersheim explains this view very well in his "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," (ii. 512.) "If we may venture an explanation," he says, "it would be that 'this' received in the Holy Eucharist, conveys to the soul as regards the Body and Blood of the Lord, the same effect as the Bread and Wine to the Body—receiving of the Bread and Cup in the Holy Communion is, really, though spiritually, to the soul what the outward elements are to the Body; that they are both the symbol and the vehicle of true inward, spiritual feeding on the Very Body and Blood of Christ."

In favour of this view is the fact that the same form of expression is often used in Scripture to denote "*spiritual identity*," e.g., St. Matthew v. 13, "Ye are the salt of the earth" (*i.e.*, spiritually); St. John x. 7, "I am the door" (spiritually); St. John xiv. 6, "I am the way" (spiritually); St. John xv. 1, "I am the vine," "Ye are the branches" (spiritually); and similarly "Ye are our Epistle" (ii. Cor. iii. 2) and "Ye are the temple of the living God" (ii. Cor. vi. 16).

This interpretation is of course quite a possible one, and has none of the difficulties of what has been called "the physical identity" theory.

Yet, against it must be placed the fact that, on this theory, the same interpretation cannot be given to the words in reference to the cup ("this cup is the new covenant in My blood"—Luke and 1 Cor.—or "This—cup—is My blood of the covenant"—Mark, Matthew.) These words cannot be explained so as to give a rational meaning with this interpretation of "*spiritual identity*." To attempt to do so would only lead to absurdity of statement.

It appears to the writer that this last-mentioned fact seriously affects the probability of this view.

Any interpretation to be correct ought to be equally

applicable to both the words used in reference to the "bread" and to the "cup." This is not so either on the view last mentioned or on the view that takes the copula literally as denoting actual physical or substantial identity, and militates strongly against the credibility of either.

The disciples, moreover, are more likely to have understood the words in the sense of the "representative" interpretation than in the sense of the "spiritual identity" theory—the analogy of the Passover formula, which would be in their minds at the time, being distinctly in favour of this view. Certainly they would not have understood the words of actual physical or substantial identity.

It is clear that this idea of "physical identity"—the idea that the bread had become or contained the physical body of Christ which was "born of the Virgin" would never for one moment occur to their minds. Indeed the whole idea of such an identification would be repellent to a Jewish mind: for to partake of blood was abomination to a Jew.

"The idea of eating human flesh and drinking human blood would have inspired the Apostles with unspeakable horror; and it is incredible that Christ can have intended to shock them with any such doctrine. He had warned them beforehand (John vi. 63) against any such carnal notion" (Dr. Plummer in Hastings D.B. Art. "Lord's Supper," vol. iii. p. 149b.)

Moreover this theory involves us, as we have already hinted, in difficulty in reference to our Lord's words: "This (cup) is My blood of the new covenant," "This cup is the new covenant in My blood."

If the literal meaning of the "is" as expressing actual identity be insisted on in the first form of words in reference to the bread, it must logically be also insisted on here, and we must interpret "This cup,"

not "symbolizes" but *actually is* "My blood of the covenant" or "the new covenant in My blood," which leads us into absurdity, and indeed is an interpretation proposed by no one. These words of the cup can only be taken figuratively. The fact then that in the one case we are obliged to take the words figuratively is a strong argument in favour of the figurative interpretation in the other case also.

A view that is common in the present day may perhaps be conveniently noted here. According to this view the Body present in the elements is *not* the natural body as bruised on the cross as such, but "the glorified Body." The words : "This is My body" must then be taken as equivalent to "This bread has under its form the presence of My glorified body." But in reply it may at once be pointed out that if this be so, then the Lord's Supper as now administered is not the same as the original Lord's Supper, for our Lord's "Glorified Body" could not possibly then be present "under the form or veil" of the consecrated elements, for that "glorified body" or "spiritual body," as it is sometimes called, was *then* non-existent. It was of His body as "given" and "broken" for us on the cross that our Lord spoke, *not* of His "glorified" or "spiritual" body.

And again, if it be said that the words : "This is My Body" mean : "This has under its form the Presence of My body;" what then we may ask has become of the literal sense of the word "is" which we are sometimes told is ignored by Protestants, but preserved by those who reject the figurative interpretation?

Taking into consideration all the facts of the case, there is really no half-way house between the exact literal interpretation of the "is" and the figurative interpretation. The former as we have seen, cannot

stand, the latter gives a consistent meaning and must therefore be the true one.

We pass now to two other disputed points in the accounts of the Institution, *i.e.*, the meaning of $\tauοῦτο$ $\piοιεῖτε$ ("This do") and of $eἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν$ ("in remembrance of Me.")

We shall deal with $\tauοῦτο$ $\piοιεῖτε$ first. The question is, "Do these words mean 'Do this'—Perform this action, or do they mean: 'Do this' in a sacrificial sense, *i.e.*, are they equivalent to 'offer this?'" On this point I cannot, I think, do better than quote the weighty remarks of Dr. Plummer in his commentary on St. Luke in the International Critical Commentary Series, pp. 497—498 and supplement them by two short quotations, the one from Canon Mason's: "The Faith of the Gospel," and the other from Bishop Gore's: "The Body of Christ."

Dr. Plummer says in the book referred to above:

"The proposal to give these words a sacrificial meaning and translate them, 'offer, this, sacrifice this, offer this sacrifice,' cannot be maintained. It has against it (1) the *ordinary meaning* of $\piοιεῖν$ in N.T. in LXX., and in Greek literature generally; (2) the authority of all the *Greek Fathers*, who knew their own language, knew the N. T. and the LXX., and understood the words as having the ordinary meaning, 'Perform this action; ' (3) the authority of the *Early Liturgies*, which do not use $\piοιεῖν$ or *facere* when the bread and wine are offered, but $\piροσφέρειν$ or *offerre*, although the words of institution precede the oblation, and thus suggest $\piοιεῖν$ or *facere*; (4) the authority of a *large majority of commentators*, ancient and modern, of the most various schools, who either make no comment, as if the ordinary meaning were too obvious to need stating; or give the ordinary meaning without mentioning any other as worthy of consideration; or

expressly reject the sacrificial meaning; (5) the testimony of the *Septuagint*, in which the various and frequent Hebrew words which mean 'offer' or 'sacrifice' are translated, not by *ποιεῖν*, but by *προσφέρειν* or *ἀναφέρειν* or the like; (6) the fact that here and in 1 Cor. xi. 24, the writer might easily have made the sacrificial meaning clear by using *προσφέρειν* or *ἀναφέρειν*. He has not even suggested such a meaning, as he might have done by writing *ποιεῖτε τοῦτον*, i.e., *τοῦτον τὸν ἄρτον*. He has given as a translation of Christ's words neither 'offer this bread,' nor 'offer this' nor 'do this bread' (which might have suggested 'offer this bread,') but 'do this thing.'"

Canon Mason says :

"The rendering 'offer this' has against it the fact that it is of recent origin. All the Greek Fathers with the exception of Justin Martyr, treated the words as 'Perform this action.' " (Faith of the Gospel, 2nd Edit. p. 328 note).

It may be noted that Dr. Plummer does not consider Justin Martyr to be an exception (Plummer "St. Luke" International Critical Commentary, p. 497 note, and Expositor, Third Series, vol. vii. p. 444f.)

We may sum up in the words of Bishop Gore :

"On the whole then, there is not sufficient evidence to entitle us to say that *ποιεῖν* bears the sacrificial sense in the New Testament." ("The Body of Christ" 4th Edit. Appended Note 20, p. 318) and we may add in the words of the present Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford (Dr. Ince) : "Not one English Greek scholar sanctions the translation of *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* 'offer this,' e.g., Thirlwall, C. Wordsworth, Ellicott, Alford, Westcott."

We conclude therefore from the above evidence, which is of quite an impartial character, that the words

τοῦτο ποιεῖτε mean not “offer this sacrifice” but “Perform this action.” “Do what I have done.” “Break bread and drink wine, with thanksgiving, in remembrance of me.”

Next, as regards *εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν ἀνάμνησιν* (“in remembrance of me”)

It has been said :

“The primary thought suggested in the word ‘memorial’ (*ἀνάμνησις*) is that of a memorial before God, though without excluding the idea of a memento to man.” (Darwell Stone in Hastings Dict. of Christ and the Gospels, Art. “Lord’s Supper,” ii. vol. ii. p. 74a).

And in proof of this assertion Mr. Darwell Stone refers to the use of the word in the LXX. and Hebrews x. 3. The passages to which he refers in the LXX. are Lev. xxiv. 7; Numb. x. 10; Ps. xxxvii. 1 (=in Hebrew xxxviii. 1); Ps. lxix. 1 (=in Hebrew lxx. 1) and Wisdom xvi. 6. Of these passages he says: “In Wisdom xvi. 6 it denotes a reminder to man; in the other four passages it denotes a memorial before God.”

An examination of these passages, however, does not seem quite to warrant so definite a statement.

In Ps. xxxvii. 1 (=in Hebrew xxxviii. 1) and Ps. lxix. 1 (=in Hebrew lxx. 1) the word occurs in the titles of the Psalms. These titles have commonly been explained to refer to the contents of the Psalms as a record of suffering, though they have also been explained as meaning “to bring the suppliant to God’s remembrance,” and by some are connected in thought with the Levitical ritual and explained as a note of the liturgical use of the Psalms either (1) in connection with the offering of incense *i.e.*, as a prayer for use at the offering of incense (incense symbolized prayer and the assigning of a special prayer like these Psalms to such a time as the offering of

incense would therefore be quite natural); or (2) at the Azkārā or Memorial. This was a technical term in the Levitical Ritiul for (a) the incense placed on the shewbread and afterwards burnt (Lev. xxiv. 7); (b) the portion of the "meal"—offering mixed with oil and burnt with incense on the altar (Lev. ii. 2).

These passages are thus seen to be ambiguous, for the word as used here may mean "recollection" pure and simple, or it may mean "to bring the suppliant to God's remembrance" without any idea of a sacrificial meaning. And even if connected with the offering of incense or the Azkārā or Memorial, it proves nothing as to the Lord's Supper being a sacrifice presented as a memorial to God.

Canon Meyrick in his book on "The Doctrine of the Holy Communion," (pp. 16 and 17) has well said in reference to this connection with the Azkārā :

"If it proved anything as to the sacrificial character of the material offering in the Holy Communion, it would prove, not that it was a sacrifice, but that it was one particular part of a sacrifice, and *that* not the part which was eaten and drunk, but that part which was never to be consumed by either priest or people, and which could not have been eaten or drunk without the greatest impiety."

Let us look next at Numbers x. 10. There it is said of the act of blowing the trumpets at certain times and feasts: "They shall be to you for a memorial before your God." This probably means that the blowing of the trumpets was to remind the people of God, "to call God to their remembrance," and to put them in mind of certain religious duties: though, as Bishop Drury has pointed out: "it is at least possible that the word was meant to convey the idea of reminding God and we may compare the words of verse 9: "And ye shall sound with the trumpets and ye shall be

remembered (*ἀναμνησθήσεσθε*) before the Lord." (Essay "Lord's Supper" in "Church and Faith," p. 173).

This passage then, again, is of doubtful significance.

The last passage is Lev. xxiv. 7. The passage in the LXX. differs from the Hebrew followed by A.V. The latter reads: "And thou shalt put pure frankincense upon each row that it may be on the bread for a memorial, even an offering made by fire unto the Lord;" while in the LXX. we read of the shewbread (not of the frankincense as in the Hebrew). "And they (the loaves) shall be for a memorial."

To whom the loaves were to be a memorial is at least doubtful. The shewbread appears to have been "a concrete expression of the fact that Jehovah was the source of every material blessing" and Sabbath by Sabbath "the priestly representatives of the nation renewed this outward and visible acknowledgment of man's continual dependence upon God." (Art. "Shewbread," Hastings Dict. Bible, Vol. iv. p. 497a).

If this interpretation be correct, as we believe it is, then surely the idea is rather of a "memorial" or reminder to the *people* through their representatives, than a memorial offering to God. The exact sense is at least doubtful.

An examination of the passages in the Old Testament, relied on as proving that *ἀνάμνησις* is "a memorial before God" (Darwell Stone) and has "a distinctly sacrificial meaning" (Vernon Staley, Catholic Religion, 10th Edit. p. 265) shows that to say the least they are no proof either for or against.

In addition to what has been already said on this point, we must remember that there is no denying the fact that the regular word for a sacrificial memorial before God in the XLX. is *not* *ἀνάμνησις* but an entirely different word *μνημόσυνον*.

This turns the balance distinctly in favour of the

meaning "memento to man" rather than (sacrificial) "memorial before God."

The only passage in the New Testament (i.e. Hebrews x., 3) in which the word occurs outside the Luke-Paul account of the Institution is distinctly in favour of the simple meaning "recollection."

The passage is as follows, "But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance made of sins year by year." (R.V.).

Obviously, as the context shows, the word is here used not of "a remembrance before God," but of a "calling to mind by man." The context clearly states that "the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience (or consciousness) of sins" if the sacrifices offered year by year continually had been able to make the comers thereunto perfect.

But, the writer proceeds, far from that being the case, far from the worshippers having no more consciousness of sins, "in those sacrifices there is a remembrance made of sins year by year;" year by year the worshipper is perpetually reminded of sin and of the need of expiation.

This passage therefore strongly supports the interpretation of our Lord's words "Do this in remembrance of me," which takes them to mean "Do this that it may be for ever a memento to you of Me and of My vicarious sacrifice for you and all mankind."

A learned authority, Dr. T. K. Abbott, in his "Essays on the original texts of the Old and New Testaments" and in "A Reply to Criticisms" has dealt very exhaustively with this question and has come to the conclusion, "Most distinctly *ἀνάμνησις* is not a sacrificial term; it never means or can mean "memorial offering." ("Reply" p. 41).

And Bishop Gore has summed up the case thus:

"On the whole then, there is not sufficient evidence

to entitle us to say that *ποιεῖν* bears the sacrificial sense in the New Testament. The matter stands similarly with *ἀνάμνησις* . . . (and as to the latter he adds) . . . “The weak point in the case of those who maintain it (i.e., the sacrificial sense of *ἀνάμνησις*) is the fact that it was not apparently so understood by the Christian Church. The phrase of the anaphora, “Therefore we remembering Thy blessed passion,” etc., *μεμνημένοι οὐν* implies that they understood our Lord’s words to mean, “This do to remember me.” And this phrase probably goes back to very early times (“The Body of Christ,” 4th Edit. Appended Note, 20. 1 and 2. p. 318). The Latin liturgies give a similar testimony, “Unde memores,” etc.

Before leaving the accounts of the Institution we must note that in the three Synoptic accounts our Lord calls the consecrated wine most distinctly “this fruit of the vine” and similarly in 1 Cor. xi. 26. (whether our Lord or St. Paul be viewed as the original utterer of these words) the consecrated bread is still spoken of as “bread,” just as St. Paul in the note that he appends to his account of the Institution (1 Cor. xi. 27 and 28) twice over calls the bread still “bread” after consecration.

These facts clearly show that no transformation of the elements into some other substance was contemplated by either the Lord or his Apostle.

CHAPTER I—(*continued*)

Passing from the accounts of the Institution we find that there are two other passages which claim our attention as unmistakably referring to this subject, i.e., 1 Cor. x. 14—22; 1 Cor. xi. 26—29.

First then, 1 Cor. x. 14—22. The passage is as follows in R.V. :

“ Wherefore, my beloved, flee from idolatry. I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say. The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion (*κοινωνία*) of the blood of Christ ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion (*κοινωνία*) of the body of Christ ? Seeing that we who are many are one bread, one body : for we all partake (*μετέχομεν*) of the one bread. Behold Israel after the flesh : have not they which eat the sacrifices communion with the altar ? (*οὐχὶ οἱ ἐσθίοντες τὰς θυσίας κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου εἰσί*;) What say I then ? that a thing sacrificed to idols is anything or that an idol is anything ? But I say that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils and not to God, and I would not that ye should have communion with devils (*οὐ θέλω δε ὑμᾶς κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι*). Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils ; ye cannot partake (*μετέχειν*) of the table of the Lord and of the table of devils : or do we provoke the Lord to jealousy, are we stronger than He ? ”

The first point to notice here is the words, “ The cup of blessing which we bless ” (*τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὁ εὐλογοῦμεν*).

The term “cup of blessing” is a Hebraism for “the cup over which blessing is to be pronounced.” This may be the meaning here. “The cup over which the blessing is pronounced” (Ellicott), or it may mean “the cup as to which we bless” (God) : and this latter signification seems to agree more closely with the Gospel narratives of the institution in which the *εὐλογήσας* of St. Matthew and St. Mark is evidently equivalent to the *εὐχαριστήσας* of St. Luke and St. Paul.

The chief point, however, which requires elucidation, is the phrase “communion of the blood,” “communion of the body” of Christ.

The A.V. and R.V. text is practically identical except for the substitution of “a” for “the,” the R.V. having “a communion of the blood,” “a communion of the body” of Christ, not “*the communion . . .*” and the R.V. margin has the alternative rendering “a participation of.”

The word in the Greek is *κοινωνία* and the root idea of the word, which is derived from *κοινός* appears to be jointness or community.

It signifies more than “a partaking of” and it is to be distinguished from “a communication of” which in either case would be *μετοχή* or *μετάληψις* rather than *κοινωνία*. The latter is “fellowship with,” “joint participation of” and would be best so translated.

So much for the word itself. To get at the meaning of the words “communion of the blood of Christ,” “communion of the body of Christ,” we must take the context into consideration at some length.

In that context the Apostle speaks of the Israelites who eat the sacrifices as being *κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστῆριον* “joint participators of the altar” i.e., as having the altar “in common” (*κοινός*). Probably here the altar stands for the God of the altar, and

the words would mean that by eating of the sacrifices the Israelites showed their union one with another and of them all with God, whose worshippers they were.

The Apostle also speaks in the same context of the Gentiles who sacrifice to idols or rather to demons, as being *κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων* "joint participators" with the demons, where evidently the meaning is that when sacrificing to their idols or demons, the Gentiles have the demons "in common" (*κοινός*), that is to say, by their sacrificing to the demons they show their union with one another in a common worship and of them all with the demons whose worshippers they are.

In the same way he speaks of Believers who partake of the table of the Lord as having a *κοινωνία* of the body and blood of Christ, that is to say the cup of blessing as to which thanks are given is to them a joint-participation of the blood of Christ, and the bread which is broken is to them a joint-participation of the body of Christ—they have "in common" (*κοινός*) the body and blood of Christ.

By their partaking of that Table of the Lord, they show their union with one another in the body and blood of Christ i.e., in the death of their Lord ; and the partaking of the table of the Lord is a means to them of union with Christ, in that character which is indicated by the broken body and the shed blood, i.e., union with the crucified Redeemer : just as partaking of the sacrifices was to the Israelite a means of union with his God or at least of the realization of that union, and partaking of the demon feast was to the Gentile a means of union with the demons whose worshipper he was.

Before we leave this passage it would be well to note that in a sacrificial context in which there is a definite mention of the Jewish altar (*θυσιαστηρίου*), the

Apostle, though using the sacrifices and idol feasts as, *in a certain sense*, analogous to the Lord's Supper, nevertheless speaks of the "Table" (*τραπέζα*) "of the Lord" *not* of the "Altar" (*θυσιατηρίον*) "of the Lord."

The Apostle, it is evident, did not regard the Lord's Supper as a sacrifice, else "altar" would have been the more appropriate term. It was rather to him a feast on or in memory of a sacrifice, and for this a "table" (*τραπέζα*) was the correct requisite.

The next passage is 1 Cor. xi. 26—29. (R.V.) "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim (*καταγγέλλετε*) the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup. For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he discern not the body."

We have already noticed in connection with the narratives of Institution that St. Paul in this passage calls the "bread" still "bread" after consecration. We need not then dwell further on this point.

The first point to be considered here is the meaning of *καταγγέλλετε* ("proclaim.")

This word undoubtedly means usually "oral announcement." It is the regular word for "proclaim" in the sense of proclaiming a message. Meyer says the word is never employed except in this sense. If this be so it tends to show that the recital of the words of Institution formed part of the sacred rite in Apostolic times.

Godet (*ad loc*) says, "the term *καταγγέλλειν* vividly recalls the word Haggadah, which denoted in the Jewish Passover the historical explanation of the meaning of all the rites of the Paschal feast which the

father, in answer to the eldest son's ritual question, gave to his family ; " and suggests that " the narrative of the Lord's death was similarly rehearsed at the Holy Supper."

The word most certainly cannot mean " proclaiming before God " much less pleading, or presenting or exhibiting before Him ; though it may, and I think does, include the idea of the Lord's Supper as " a visible word."

Both by the recital of the words of institution and by the broken bread and outpoured wine, and the separation of the elements, each being kept distinct, the church is perpetually reminded of the death of Christ her Lord.

The other points to notice in this passage are :

1. *The words, " Till He come."*

These words link the feast to our Lord's Second Coming: but also most certainly imply His bodily *absence* for " Commemoration ceases when He who is commemorated returns."

2. *The meaning of eating and drinking " unworthily."*

Various interpretations have been suggested. Either " without repentance " (Theodoret); " with contempt of the poor " (Chrysostom); " without faith " (Luther); " without self-examination " (Bengel); " without the grateful memory of Christ's sufferings, a memory which necessarily implies the breaking of the will with sin " (Godet).

No doubt all these meanings are included, but the primary meaning which appears from the context is that " unworthily " denotes the spirit which looked upon the Lord's Supper as an ordinary meal and did not recognize its sacred character and solemn meaning.

3. *The import of the words " guilty of the body and blood of the Lord."*

The Apostle seems to say that those who partake of

this ordinance "unworthily," with none of the requisite moral conditions, as if it were an ordinary meal, in a measure share the guilt of those who crucified His sacred body and shed His precious blood. The bread is the symbol of His body and the wine the symbol of His blood (see discussion of accounts of Institution above). Whoever then treats these sacred symbols with contempt or profanity may be looked upon as united in spirit with those who put the Lord to death, and therefore as guilty with them.

4. *The significane of the words : He that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself if he discern not the body*" ($\mu\eta\delta\alpha\kappa\rho\nu\omega\tau\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$).

"If he discern not the body," i.e., if he do not distinguish between ($\delta\alpha\kappa\rho\nu\epsilon\iota\upsilon$) the sacred elements and common food. This is the most common interpretation and is favoured by the A.V., "the Lord's body." But R.V. has simply "if he discern not the body." With this reading it is supposed by many that the Apostle means by "the body" not "the Lord's body" symbolized by the Bread, in which case he would almost surely have added, as he does above "and the blood"; but that he refers to the "Church," the company of believers, which is viewed in scripture as "the body of Christ." (1 Cor. xii. 27; Eph. iv. 12; Col. i. 18. etc.)

His meaning would then be that those who came to the Lord's Table should remember that they must act as members of the body of Christ. They must estimate aright ($\delta\alpha\kappa\rho\nu\epsilon\iota\upsilon$) the body i.e., they must remember that in that body all were on an equality, and at the Table of the Lord there must be no emphasizing of social distinctions as appears to have been the case at Corinth, the rich jostling aside and treating contemptuously their poorer brethren.

5. *The exhortation to self-examination (in verse 28)*

previous to reception is the last point to notice here. No comment is needed beyond noting that evidently a certain moral condition is here presupposed as requisite to a worthy partaking, and to assure himself of this must be the duty of every intending communicant.

We have now considered all the passages that *unmistakably* refer to the subject before us.

There are, of course, several allusions in the Acts of the Apostles to the “breaking of bread”; but it is by no means certain that this *always* refers to the Lord’s Supper, though the prevalent interpretation both in ancient and modern times has been that a celebration of the Lord’s Supper is intended.

Certainly in one passage, Acts xxvii. 35. (The Shipwreck Passage) such an interpretation is out of the question. The reference in the other passages, Acts ii. 42., xx. 7 and 11., seems to be to the Lord’s Supper, but even there it must be borne in mind *not* to the Lord’s Supper as now understood, but of the Lord’s Supper as part of the evening meal or *ἀγάπη* of its separation from which there is no trace in Scripture. Indeed it is to the *ἀγάπη* or “Love Feast” of which at this time the Lord’s Supper formed a part, that the *κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου* (“breaking of bread”) seems rather to refer. In this term, therefore, the Eucharist may or may not be included. Dr. Plummer in Hastings’ Dictionary of the Bible, (Article “Lord’s Supper” Vol. iii. p. 144a) says that it is “doubtful whether the Eucharist is included in *κλῶντες κατ’ οἶκον ἄρτον* (Acts ii. 46) “breaking bread from house to house” and adds, “If Acts ii. 46 does not refer to the Eucharist, then the supposition that the Eucharist was celebrated daily in the earliest ages has no foundation: Acts xx. 7—11, points to Sunday as the usual day.”

Certainly these passages in the Acts are not *unmistakably* enough references to the Lord’s Supper to

warrant the deduction of definite conclusions on this point. There are, however, two other passages, one of them very important, that are sometimes considered to have to do with the Lord's Supper. I refer to Hebrews xiii. 10. ("We have an altar") and to St. John 6.

The first passage need not detain us long.

It runs as follows :

" We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle."

An examination of the context, shows us that there is nothing in that context which refers to the Lord's Supper and by no proper method of exegesis can such an allusion be maintained in the verse before us.

Moreover, we may say in addition that an " altar " implies a sacrifice and a sacrificing priest.

Now it is the one purpose of the Epistle to teach the uniqueness of our Lord's Sacrifice and Priesthood and it would indeed be strange if at last the writer introduced an element contrary or at least foreign to all that preceded.

The reference of the passage to the Lord's Table cannot be maintained consistently with the context and the general tenor and purport of the Epistle as a whole.

The " altar " here has usually been understood—even by St. Thomas Aquinas, the great Roman Catholic theologian—to signify the Cross : or Christ Himself—the alternative view suggested by the same writer. In this latter case to eat from it will mean " to partake of the fruit of Christ's passion."

The most that could be *rightly* made of this passage would be as the late Dean Farrar pointed out (Cambridge Bible "Hebrews" p. 189) to see in it a *very indirect reference* to the Lord's Supper, though he himself doubted even this ; but on no account, he says, can

there rightly be deduced from it any reference to the Lord's Table as a *θυσιαστήριον* or "altar."

Applications of the passage to the Lord's Table or to "the heavenly altar" are entirely unwarranted by the context.

The next passage, St. John vi., demands rather fuller treatment.

The discourse on "The Bread of Life" recorded in this chapter was delivered by our Lord about a year before His crucifixion.

The chief portion of that discourse consists of the following passages (R.V.)

"I am the bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and they died. This is the bread which cometh down out of heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. I am the living bread which came down out of heaven; if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever: yea, the bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove one with another saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?

"Jesus therefore said unto them, verily, verily I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him. As the living Father sent me and I live because of the Father; so he that eateth Me he also shall live because of me. This is the bread which came down out of heaven: not as the fathers did eat and died: he that eateth this bread shall live for ever."

And when many of His Disciples who heard these words, said, evidently puzzled, "This is a hard saying; Who can hear it?" our Lord in His reply said, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit and are life."

As to this passage, one thing at least is clear, as Bishop Westcott has pointed out in an Additional Note to chapter vi. in his Commentary on St. John, and it is this :

The discourse “cannot refer primarily to the Holy Communion ; nor again can it be simply prophetic of that Sacrament. The teaching has a full and consistent meaning in connexion with the actual circumstances, and it treats essentially of spiritual realities with which no external act as such, can be co-extensive. The well-known words of Augustine, *crede et manducasti*, ‘believe and thou hast eaten,’ give the sum of the thoughts in a luminous and pregnant sentence.” (p. 113, “Commentary on St. John.”)

At the same time it is held by many (Bishop Westcott amongst them) that our Lord did refer to the Lord’s Supper *indirectly*; that “while speaking intelligibly to those who heard Him at the time, He gave by anticipation a commentary, so to speak, on the sacrament which He afterwards instituted.” (Westcott *ad loc.*)

It does not appear, however, that the passage taken as a whole and carefully weighed is capable of this interpretation any more than it is capable of an interpretation that confines its reference exclusively to the Lord’s Supper.

Our Lord is speaking of something that is absolutely and indispensably necessary to salvation (“ Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood ye have not life in yourselves ”). It seems only confusing to drag in an ordinance that is not *absolutely* necessary to salvation and insisting that our Lord had it in view.

Moreover, a fatal objection to this view is that more than once our Lord says that “ he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever,” *i.e.*, of course obviously shall have the enjoyment of eternal life in glory for ever ;

and to hold that all who eat the sacramental bread of necessity shall live for ever in the sense in which our Lord meant the words is plainly contrary to fact. Multitudes who partake of that sacramental bread lead anything but Christlike lives and evidence only too clearly by their lives that they are not in living union with the Christ.

The correct interpretation of the passage I believe to be that which sees in it no reference whatever (direct or indirect) to the Lord's Supper, but which considers that our Lord spoke only of a spiritual feeding upon Himself by the soul by faith.

Perhaps the words of the late Bishop J. C. Ryle express this view most clearly.

"I believe," he says, "that by 'flesh and blood' our Lord meant the sacrifice of His own body for us, when He offered it up as our substitute on Calvary. I believe that by 'eating and drinking' He meant that communion and participation of the benefit of His sacrifice which faith and faith only conveys to the soul. I believe His meaning to be, 'Except ye believe on Me as the one sacrifice for sin and by faith receive into your hearts the redemption purchased by My blood, ye have no eternal life and will not be saved.' The atonement of Christ, His vicarious death and sacrifice, and faith in it—these things are the key to the whole passage. I believe this must be kept steadily in view" ("Expository Thoughts on the Gospels," St. John, Vol. i. p. 402).

It may be mentioned that this view of no reference at all to the Lord's Supper was also that of the late Bishop Lightfoot and of Ferus, the Roman Catholic writer, the latter of whom says in his commentary on St. Matthew :

"He speaketh not here (John vi. 53) of the Sacrament; for not all are condemned who take not the

sacrament. He speaketh of spiritual eating; that is, of faith in Christ. . . . In this manner even the Fathers of the Old Testament did eat the body of Christ, for Christ was offered to them also in the promises," (Quoted from Dr. " Griffith Thomas' " Sacrament of our Redemption, p. 12).

No doubt when our Lord appointed the Lord's Supper, He had in view the doctrine of this passage, and used words intended to remind His Disciples of it.

The truth seems to lie here. The Lord's Supper (as *one* means of spiritual feeding upon Christ) referred back to the discourse, rather than that the discourse was anticipatory and prophetic of the Supper : or perhaps better still, they do not refer so much the one to the other as that both refer to the same thing. The great lesson of both one and the other is that only by a personal appropriation of the Lord's atoning death can the sinner obtain eternal life in Him.

We have now reached the end of our consideration of the subject from the point of view of the Teaching of Scripture.

A summary of New Testament teaching on the subject will not be amiss before we pass on.

It may be well (in view of the developments of ceremonial in connection with this sacrament and the elaboration of Eucharistic doctrine, in after ages) to notice first the *extreme simplicity* that characterized the original institution and that is a characteristic feature of all Scriptural allusions to that sacred Rite.

The place of Institution was the upper room of a Jewish house ; the time was evening ; after the close of the Passover meal ; and at a *table*. There was an entire absence of ostentatious display and elaborate and intricate ceremonial. *Simplicity* was the key-note of that first Lord's Supper.

Then as to the doctrine. The supreme thought is

Remembrance: "This do in remembrance of me." When we observe that ordinance we are to recall the Lord and his death upon the Cross and the "benefits which we receive thereby."

But there is also to be *appropriation*. The bread is to be eaten and the wine drunk. So there is to be spiritual appropriation of Christ by the soul by faith. Of this appropriation this sacred ordinance is one of the means.

And all this is to be done "not in secret and alone, but in company with others." We are to "show forth" or "proclaim" the Lord's Death "till He come," and the observance of this feast is to remind us of our oneness in Christ, "that we being many are one bread, one body" even as we are all partakers of that one bread. (i. Cor. x. 17).

Last of all this ordinance is directly connected with the future. It points on to the coming of our Lord and bids us look forward to it.

It thus speaks of the *Past*, the *Present* and the *Future*.

Of the *Past*—the sacrifice once for all offered, perfected and completed on the cross of Calvary for the sins of the whole world.

Of the *Present*—the duty of our personal appropriation by faith of the benefits of that "precious blood-shedding" and of the unity in Christ of all who thus by faith appropriate Him.

Of the *Future*—the second coming of our Lord and the gathering of His people unto Him.

CHAPTER II

"THE TEACHING OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH"

We pass now to :

"THE TEACHING OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH,"

i.e., of the Church of the *First Six Centuries*.

We shall consider first the testimony of the Ancient Liturgies as far as they can be traced up to this date, i.e., up to 6th century or thereabouts ; and then, the witness of the Fathers, apart from the actual liturgies themselves or traces of them derived from the writings of the Fathers.

We note at once at the outset that for this date we have only one complete liturgy, i.e., the Clementine Liturgy, found in the Apostolical Constitutions, but from various sources, chiefly the Didaché and the writings of the Fathers, we are able to roughly estimate the character of the Liturgy at this period and to construct a rough sketch of it at different parts of this period.

For these rough sketches I am indebted to Mr. Brightman's invaluable book, "Liturgeries Eastern and Western," (vol. i. Eastern Liturgies,) where will be found the original, of which I give a translation, except in the case of the Didaché, in which case the translation is that given by the late Dr. C. H. H. Wright in "Church and Faith."

The earliest description of a Liturgy is that in the Didaché or "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,"

of which the date is probably from A.D. 120 to the close of the second century. The information is found in chapters ix. and part of xiv. of that work.

The major portion of this must be cited :

Chap. ix. :—“ Concerning the Eucharist, give thanks thus—First, concerning the cup : We thank Thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David Thy servant (the vine is probably Messiah) which Thou hast made known to us by Thy servant Jesus (so we translate *τοῦ παιδος σου* in all places, because the reference is to Is. 53. The R.V. rightly translates the same expression thus in the two passages : Acts iii. 13—26 ; iv. 27—30). “To Thee be the glory for ever! But concerning the broken bread (*τοῦ κλάσματος*) We thank Thee, our Father, for the life and the knowledge which Thou hast made known to us through Thy servant Jesus. To Thee be the glory for ever. As this broken bread (*τὸ κλάσμα*) was once scattered (in grains) upon the mountains and when gathered together became one (loaf) so let Thy church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy Kingdom. For Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever. But let no one eat or drink of your Eucharist but such as have been baptized in the name of the Lord ; for concerning this the Lord said : ‘ Give not that which is holy to the dogs.’ ”

Chap. x.—“ But after being filled thus give thanks : We thank Thee, Holy Father, for Thy holy name which thou hast tabernacled (*κατεσκήνωσας* *cp. ἐσκηνωσεν* John i. 14) in our hearts, and for the knowledge and faith and immortality which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus Thy servant ; to Thee be the glory for ever ! Thou Master Almighty (*δέσποτα*), didst create all things for Thy name’s sake, and food and drink hast Thou given to men for enjoyment, that they may give thanks (*εὐχαριστήσωσιν*) to Thee ; but

to us Thou hast graciously given (*ἐχαρίσω*) spiritual food and drink and eternal life through Thy servant. Before all we give thanks to Thee because Thou art mighty ! To Thee be the glory for ever ! Remember, Lord, Thy Church, to deliver her from every evil and to perfect her in Thy love. And gather her together from the four winds, her that is sanctified, into Thy kingdom, which Thou hast prepared for her ; for Thine is the power and glory for ever ! Let grace come and let this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David ! If anyone is holy let him come ; if anyone is not let him repent. Maranatha (our Lord is coming). Amen."

Such were the stated formulae (as far as then fixed) before and after the Eucharist was distributed. Immediately after the above is added : " But suffer ye the prophets to give thanks (*εὐχαριστεῖν*) as they desire." That is, "the prophets" then in the Church were not to be bound to use those liturgical forms.

In chapter xiv. the following directions are given for ordinary church services :

" But on each Lord's Day (*κυριακὴν*) of the Lord, when assembled together break bread and give thanks, after you have confessed your transgressions in order that our sacrifice (*ἡ θυσία ἡμῶν* MS. but Bryennius edits *ἱμῶν*) may be pure. But let none that hath strife with his comrade come together with you until they be reconciled, that your sacrifice (*ἡ θυσία ἡμῶν*) be not defiled. For this is that which was spoken by the Lord : ' In every place and time bring Me a clean sacrifice ; because I am a great king, saith the Lord, and My name is wonderful among the nations' (Mal. i. 11 and 14)."

Now in this account of the Lord's Supper in this early age, we notice :

1. The extreme simplicity that characterizes the administration. A liturgy exists but in a very elementary stage and even this need not always be used. In the case of "the prophets" it may be dispensed with and the service be extempore.

2. The absence of any command to employ in the administration the words of "consecration" made use of at the original institution of the Lord's Supper.

This point is noteworthy because it has come to light since the discovery of the Didaché by Archbishop Bryennius of Nicomedia in 1883, that in the public liturgy of the Assyrian or Nestorian Christians, which is certainly of a very ancient date, these words of consecration have been also omitted for centuries.

As to this two theories have been held : (a) That they were said from memory by the celebrant; (b) That the omission was an original feature in the liturgy as used in ancient times. In either case the omission is remarkable.

3. A third point to notice is the prominence of thanksgiving.

4. The mention of the union of believers typified by the "broken bread" and "one loaf," reminding us of i. Cor. x. 17.

5. The words in the post-communion thanksgivings, "We thank Thee, Holy Father, for Thy holy name which Thou hast tabernacled in our *hearts*," and the words: "to us Thou hast graciously given *spiritual* food and drink and eternal life through Thy servant," are significant as descriptive of the nature of the Presence in that Sacred Feast and as to the character of the food received.

6. The careful instructions as to the qualifications for reception are also noteworthy. "Let none eat or drink of your Eucharist but such as have been *baptized* in the name of the Lord," and "If anyone is

holy let him come, if anyone is not let him repent," and "Let none that hath strife with his comrades come together with you until they be reconciled."

7. Another point to notice is the prayer for Christ's "Church"—for her deliverance from evil, her perfection and her completion.

8. The absence of any mention of prayer for the departed in connection with this Rite.

9. The words "Hosanna to the God of David" reminding us of the "Gloria in excelsis" of a later date.

10. The mention of public confession of sin before communicating.

11. The use of the term *θυσία* ("sacrifice") in a sense unexplained, but probably designating what we now call : "this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," and including the sacrifice of "ourselves, our souls and bodies." This is at least the most that can be gathered from the context. Any other interpretation (e.g., of propitiatory sacrifice) would find no support from the passage taken as a whole.

12. The Lord's Supper seems to have been celebrated weekly.

13. Its usual name at this time was : "The Eucharist" (see title chap. ix. *περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε*).

The next account, containing hints as to the Liturgy, is in *Justin Martyr's Apology* (circa 138, A.D.)

He says that after a baptism it was the custom to offer prayers for the newly enlightened convert (*καὶ τοῦ φωτισθέντος*), and for the brethren to salute one another with a kiss of peace.

He continues :

"Then is presented (*προσφέρεται*) to the brother who presides (*ὁ προεστῶς τῶν ἀδελφῶν*), bread and a cup of water and mixed wine (*κράματος*), and he, receiving

them, sends up praise and glory to the Father of all, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and offers a thanksgiving (*εὐχαριστίαν*) at some length for that He has vouchsafed to us these blessings. And when he has finished the prayers and thanksgiving all the people present respond by saying Amen. And after the president has given thanks and the people responded, those who are called among us deacons give to each of those who are present to partake of the bread and wine and water, over which thanks have been given, and carry them to those not present. And this meal is called with us eucharistic, of which none is permitted to partake except one who believes that the things taught by us are true, and who has passed through the washing for remission of sins and new birth and so lives as Christ commanded. For we receive these not as common bread or common drink, but as Jesus Christ our Saviour being incarnate by the Word of God possessed both flesh and blood for our salvation, so also we were taught that the food over which thanksgiving has been made by the utterance in prayer of the word derived from Him (*τὴν δὲ εὐχῆς λόγου τὸν παρ’ αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν*)—that food from which our blood and flesh are, by assimilation, nourished, is the flesh and blood of that incarnate Jesus. For the Apostles, in the memoirs which they wrote which are called Gospels, transmitted to us that Jesus Christ thus charged them, that after taking bread and giving thanks He said : ‘ Do this in remembrance of Me ; this is My body,’ and that in like manner after taking the cup and giving thanks, He said : ‘ This is My blood,’ and that He gave to partake to them alone.” (Apology, i. c. 65.)

The same ceremony is more briefly described in the next chapter of his book in the account of the ordinary Sunday services, with the addition that the president

sends up prayers and thanksgivings ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ
“ according to his ability.”

From his dialogue with Trypho we learn that mention was also made at the Eucharist of the sufferings which the Son of God underwent (Dialogue, section 117) and also that he connects the notion of sacrifice with the Eucharist. He speaks of the acceptableness of the sacrifices (*θυσίας*) which Christ ordained : “ that is over the Eucharist or thanks-offering (*ἐπὶ τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ*) of the bread and the cup ; and he regards the offering of the fine flour (Lev. xiv. 10) as a type of the Eucharist.

It may be noted that Justin also tells us in his account of the ordinary Sunday services that : “ the records of the Apostles or the writings of the prophets were read by a special reader and when he had ceased, the President instructed the congregation urging them to imitate the noble things of which they had heard.”

In the account of Justin we note the following :

1. Lections from Old and New Testament.
2. Sermon.
3. Prayers for the newly enlightened, etc.
4. Kiss of Peace.
5. Offering of the elements to the President.
6. Use of water and wine (though without a trace of the ceremonial of a later date).
7. Very long (*ἐπὶ πολὺ*) Thanksgiving.
8. Thanksgiving for the benefits of Redemption, including presumably the words of Institution, though it is not expressly stated, but they are quoted in the next chapter.
9. The name Eucharist (already noticed in the *Didaché*).
10. The qualifications of recipients :

1. Faith (" believes that the things taught by us are true ; ")
 2. Baptism (" passed through the washing for remission of sins and new birth ; ")
 3. Good living (" so lives as Christ commanded.")
11. The elements in his opinion are still " bread " and " wine " after consecration, because the deacons distribute bread and wine and water to give to those present and carry to the absent, and after consecration, further, he speaks of the " bread " as *not* " common bread " but still as " bread."
12. He also calls the elements " the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus." The passage is an obscure one ; but in whatever way Justin considered that the bread and wine became the flesh and blood of Christ it certainly was not in any way that unfitted them for giving nourishment in the ordinary way, and therefore not by their substance being taken away or changed for anything which does not give nourishment by being converted into our flesh and blood, and therefore not by Transubstantiation. And against Consubstantiation it is sufficient to observe that it is " the food which thus nourishes"—not something joined to the food which is the flesh and blood of Christ.

" In what way then can it (*i.e.*, the food) be so," we may well ask with the late Dean Goode, " but in character, operation and effect." (Goode on " The Eucharist," vol. i. p. 471.)

As regards Justin's use of *θυσία* (" sacrifice ") it should be noticed that in his writings he calls " prayers " sacrifices as well as the Eucharist.

In the Dialogue with Trypho (sect. 117) he says :

" Now that prayers and giving of thanks (*εὐχαριστίαι*), when offered by worthy men, are the only perfect and well-pleasing sacrifices to God, I

also admit. For such alone Christians have undertaken to offer."

He does not therefore, it is evident, use "sacrifice" of the Eucharist with all the meaning that the word in this connexion has since gathered to itself. It is a "sacrifice," but only in the same sense as "prayers" are.

In chapter 70 of the same Dialogue he speaks of the Eucharist simply as a remembrance.

"The bread which our Christ gave us to do for a remembrance of His becoming incarnate, for those who believe in Him for whom also He became subject to suffering; and what He gave us to drink with giving of thanks in remembrance of His own blood," and in chapter xli. he says : "Jesus Christ our Lord gave us the eucharistic bread to do for a memorial of the passion which He endured for the sake of cleansing the souls of men from all iniquities."

We now come to the first extant complete Liturgy, the so-called "*Clementine Liturgy*," found in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, which are a "manual of ecclesiastical life," compiled by the pseudo-Ignatius at Antioch or in its neighbourhood in the latter half of the 4th century (Brightman, "Liturgies Eastern and Western," vol. i. Eastern Liturgies, p. xxviii. and xxix.). The body of Rubrics relating to the ordering of the congregation appear, however, to belong to the first half of the 3rd century (Brightman p. xlviij.).

In the "*Clementine Liturgy*" we have first what is usually called : "Mass of the Catechumens," but which would, it appears to me, be better called (in view of later uses of the word "Mass" in an entirely different connotation) "Preparatory Service and Dismissal (missa) of the Catechumens, etc."

This commenced by the reading of portions of the Law and Prophets, Epistles, Acts and Gospels.

Then the bishop or president greeted the Church with the words : “ The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all.”

And the people replied :

“ And with thy spirit.”

After the greeting came the sermon (*λόγους παρακλήσεως*).

Then there followed the words :

“ Let no hearer, let no unbeliever (draw near).”

This was followed by prayers for the catechumens (*οἱ κατηχούμενοι*) followed by their dismissal.

This again was followed by prayers for those possessed of evil spirits (*οἱ ἐνεργούμενοι*) followed by their dismissal.

This again by prayers for those being enlightened (*οἱ φωτιζόμενοι*) followed by their dismissal.

Then again prayers for penitents (*οἱ ἐν μετανοίᾳ*) followed also by their dismissal.

Only the faithful now remained and the service proper—what we now call the Administration of the Holy Communion——proceeded.

It began thus :

“ Let not any who are not of the faithful come forward.”

“ Let as many as are faithful bend the knee and pray.”

Then followed prayers for the peace of the world, for the Catholic and Apostolic Church, for the dioceses : each bishop (certain of them being mentioned by name), for presbyters, deacons, readers, singers, virgins, widows and orphans, for the married, for women labouring of child, for eunuchs, for the self-controlled and pious, for those who bear fruit in the holy church and give alms to the poor, for those offering sacrifices and first fruits, for new converts, for the sick, for those who travel by water and by

land, for those in the mines, exiled, in prison, in chains, for those in grievous bondage, for enemies and those who hate us, for persecutors, for those without, and going astray ; for the young, for one another, for all Christian souls.

Then followed a prayer by the celebrant, which was followed by the Kiss of Peace introduced by the Deacon saying *πρόσχωμεν* “Let us give heed”: after which the bishop or presiding elder said: “The peace of God be with you all,” to which the people responded, “And with thy Spirit.” Then came the Kiss of Peace (as mentioned above).

After this the deacon gave warning that catechumens, hearers, unbelievers, heterodox, children, and anyone who has anything against anyone, any hypocrites, are not to draw near.

The righteous then stand to offer with fear and trembling and the deacon brings the gifts to the altar (*θυσιαστήριον*) after which the celebrant making the sign of the cross says :—

“ The grace of God Almighty, and the love of our Lord Jesus Christ and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all.”

The people answer :

“ And with thy Spirit.”

Then the celebrant says :

“ Lift up your minds.”

And all answer :—

“ We lift them up unto the Lord.”

The celebrant further says :

“ Let us give thanks unto our Lord.”

All answer :

“ It is meet and right.”

Then follows a long thanksgiving by the celebrant commencing :

“ It is very meet and right to praise Thee . . . and

blessing God for all the mercies of creation and providence : after which the people say :—

“ Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord of Sabaoth, Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory. Blessed art Thou for ever, Amen.”

Then the celebrant further says a long prayer in which he makes mention of the Incarnation and Virgin Birth, our Lord’s ministry of healing and miracles, His earthly life, betrayal, handing over to Pilate, crucifixion, death, burial, “ that He might loose the pains of death and free those over whom it held sway and break the bonds of the devil and deliver men from death ” : and then proceeds to mention the Resurrection, the Forty Days, the Ascension and Session on the Right Hand.

He then continues :—

“ Therefore we remembering what Thou hast endured for us (*μεμνημένοι οὖν ὡν δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπέμεινεν*) give thanks (*εὐχαριστοῦμεν*) not as we ought, but as we are able and in fulfilment of His command. For in the night in which He was betrayed He took bread into His holy and immaculate hands, and looking up to Thee, His God and Father, He brake and gave to His Disciples, saying, ‘ This is *τὸ μυστήριον* (“ the mystical representation ”) of the new covenant. Take of it, eat, this is My body, which is bruised for many for the remission of sins.’

“ Likewise also the cup, having mingled wine and water and hallowed it (*άγιάσας*) He gave it to them, saying, ‘ Drink ye all of it ; this is My blood [which is shed for many for the remission of sins. This do in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show (*καταγγέλλετε*) My death till I come.’

“ Therefore we remembering (*μεμνημένοι τούννυ*) His sufferings, His death, His Resurrection, His Ascension

into heaven and His second coming in which He will come to judge the living and the dead and to give to every man according to his works, offer (*προσφέρομεν*) to Thee our King and God, according to His command, this bread and this cup, giving thanks (*εὐχαριστοῦντες*) to Thee for Him through whose work and death (*ἐφ' οἷς*) we are accounted worthy to stand before Thee and to minister (*ἱερατεύειν*) unto Thee, and we ask Thee that Thou wilt graciously look down on these gifts lying before Thee, Thou God Who art in need of nought, and be well pleased with them for the glory of thy Christ, and send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this offering (*ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην*), the witness (*τὸν μάρτυρα*) of the suffering of our Lord Jesus, that He may show forth (*ὅπως ἀποφήνῃ*) this bread the body of Thy Christ and this cup the blood of Thy Christ, that those who partake of it may be strengthened in holiness, receive remission of sins, be delivered from the devil and his craft, be filled with the Holy Spirit, become worthy of Thy Christ, obtain everlasting life, Thou being reconciled to them Lord Almighty.”

Then followed Intercessions for Holy Church that it may be kept unshaken and free from persecution : for all bishops “ who teach Thy word aright ; ” for the weakness of him who now offers (*προσφέροντος*) for all presbyters, deacons, clergy, for the King and all in authority, etc. Then it continues :

“ We offer to Thee on behalf of (*προσφέρομέν σοι ὑπὲρ*) all those of all ages who have been well-pleasing to Thee, holy patriarchs, prophets, righteous apostles, martyrs, confessors, bishops, presbyters, deacons, subdeacons, readers, singers, virgins, widows, laity and all of whom Thou knowest the names.”

Then follow intercession for various classes, *e.g.*, for the city, for enemies, for catechumens, for those absent because of reasonable cause ; including a

sentence commencing *προσφέρομέν σοι ὑπὲρ* and referring to the weather and fruits.

The intercessions end up with : “ that to Thee may be all glory, majesty and thanksgiving, honour and worship to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost both now and ever and to the ages of ages without diminution and without end. Amen.”

The bishop or presiding elder then says :

“ The peace of God be with you all.”

And the people answer :

“ And with thy spirit.”

Then followed further intercession commencing :

“ Let us pray concerning the gift which has been brought to our Lord God that the good God will receive it through the mediation of His Christ to His heavenly altar for a sweet Saviour.”

Followed by prayer for “ this Church and people ; ” for all bishops, presbyters, deacons, all office-holders, the King, etc., and proceeding :

“ Let us remember (*μνημονεύσωμεν*) the holy martyrs that we may be counted worthy to have fellowship with them in persecution.”

Then intercession is offered for the lapsed, for the weather and fruits ; for new converts and for one another.

This is followed by a prayer for the people and the shepherd for the sanctification of body and soul, cleansing from all defilement of the flesh and spirit, and for help.

Then the deacon says :

“ Let us give heed.” (*πρόσχωμεν*)

The bishop then says to the people thus :

“ Holy things for holy persons.”

The people answer :

“ One holy, one Lord Jesus Christ, to the glory of God the Father blessed for ever. Amen.

“Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace, good will towards men.

“Hosanna to the Son of David. Blessed be He that cometh in the name of the Lord.

“Lord God show Thyself to us. Hosanna in the highest.”

Then comes the administration, the words of administration being :

“The Body of Christ.”

To which the communicant responds :

“Amen.”

“The Blood of Christ, the cup of life.”

To which the answer is again :

“Amen.”

A psalm is sung during the partaking. Then a thanksgiving follows :

“Let us who have partaken of the precious body and the precious blood of the Christ, give thanks that He has counted us worthy to partake of His holy mysteries (*μυστηρίων*) and let us beseech Him that it be not to our condemnation but to our salvation, to the well-being of soul and body, to the guarding of our piety, for the remission of our sins, for eternal life.

“Let us arise.

“In the grace of Christ let us offer ourselves to the only eternal God and His Christ.”

Then let the Bishop give thanks :

“Lord God Almighty, Father of Thy well-beloved Son Christ, Who hearkenest to those who call upon Thee in righteousness and Who knowest the petitions of those who are silent ; we give Thee thanks that Thou hast counted us worthy to partake of Thy holy mysteries which Thou hast prepared for us, for the assurance of those who do well, for the guarding of holiness, for the remission of trespasses, etc.”

Then follows a prayer, and then the words :

"Depart in Peace."

Such is the Liturgy.

In this Liturgy we notice that there is still great simplicity, though the service is assuming a more fixed form. Yet we must note that Mr. Brightman in "Liturgeries Eastern and Western," vol. i. p. 33, says that we gather from other parts of the author's work that "liturgical formulae are not regarded by him as rigidly fixed."

In the service itself we notice :

1. The preliminary service for catechumens and others.

2. Only the faithful remain for the actual administration.

3. The interpretation of ἀνάμνησις as a "memento to man," and not a "memorial before God, receives distinct support from this Liturgy, where twice over in the immediate connexion of the account of the Institution we have the words : "Therefore we remembering," (in the one case μεμνημένοι οὖν ὅν δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπέμεινεν, in the other μεμνημένοι τοίνυν τοῦ πάθους αὐτοῦ καὶ του θανάτου καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως καὶ τῆς εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἐπανόδου καὶ τῆς μελλούσης αὐτοῦ δευτέρας παρουσίας) showing clearly the sense in which ἀνάμνησις was understood up to the fourth century.

4. In the quoted account of the Institution we notice :

1. "Looking up to Thee His God and Father," is the equivalent of the Scripture "blessed" and of ἀγιάσας (hallowed) said of the cup lower down in the Liturgy.

2. The introduction of the words τοῦτο τὸ υπστήριον τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης is significant of the interpretation then put on τοῦτο ἔστι τὸ σῶμα.

3. The mixed chalice is mentioned—wine and

water, but there is an entire absence of ceremonial in this connexion.

4.—1. Cor. xi. 26. “As often as . . .” appears to be treated as part of the original words of Institution and not as merely the comment of St. Paul.

5. We notice further in the Liturgy as a whole phrases now familiar to us, *e.g.*, the sursum corda; trisagion; traces of Gloria in Excelsis (its position is previous to the administration): “holy mysteries.”

6. The Invocation is new; prayer is offered that God may send down His Holy Spirit ὅπως ἀποφήνῃ τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου . . (“that he may declare this bread the body of thy Christ”) not quite so strong as in after times; it may refer to revealing or declaring what they have become to the *faithful*. What follows: “that those who partake may be strengthened etc., lends support to this view.

7. The remembrance of the faithful departed (*μνημονεύσωμεν τῶν ἀγιων μαρτύρων ὅπως κοινωνοὶ γενέσθαι τῆς ἀθλήσεως αὐτῶν καταξιωθῶμεν*) and an offering of the Eucharist on behalf of the departed (*προσφέρομεν σοι ὑπέρ*).

8. Though Brightman in his “Liturgies, Eastern and Western,” inserts the note: “The Elevation,” there is no trace in the actual text or rubrics of any elevation. All that is told us is that the deacon says: “Let us give heed,” and the bishop or presiding elder addresses the people thus: “Holy things for holy persons.” The fact that in later liturgies elevation comes in here is no proof that it was so at this time.

9. We notice in this Liturgy the use of sacrificial terms, *e.g.*, *θυσιαστήριον* (“altar,”) *ἱερατεύειν* (“ministering,”) *θυσίαν* (“sacrifice,”) *προσφέρειν* (“offer,”) said of bread and cup; and mention is made of: “the heavenly altar,” prayer being offered that God will receive the gift (of bread and wine), through

the mediation of Christ, to His heavenly altar. On the other hand we have as balancing these facts that such phrases as *τὸ μυστήριον* and *τὸν μάρτυρα* occur in close connection with some of the above and that the whole tone of the Liturgy does not warrant us to read into these words all the meaning of later times.

10. Mention is made of the offering of "ourselves" to God and Christ.

11. The words of Administration call for notice. They are: *σῶμα Χριστοῦ*, "The Body of Christ" and *Αἷμα Χριστοῦ ποτήριον ζωῆς*, "The Blood of Christ, the cup of life," the recipient replying in each case "Amen."

Of the Liturgy as a whole we may say that there is an advance on the teaching of the Didaché. Sacrificial terms are becoming more established and more frequent, and the offering for the faithful departed is new, though *how* the Eucharist benefits the departed we are not told.

We must next consider the account of the *Liturgy of Palestine in the 4th Century* as given us in the *Catechetical Lectures of St. Cyril*, delivered in Jerusalem in 348 A.D., and the account given by *St. Chrysostom* (who wrote from 370—398 A.D., of the *Liturgy of Antioch*.

We shall not quote these liturgies in full as gathered from the writings of the above, but merely note any salient points or additional points to those in the Apostolical Constitutions (*Liturgy of St. Clement*) which we have already dealt with.

I. *The Liturgy of Palestine in the 4th Century* (as gathered from the Catechetical Lectures of St. Cyril of Jerusalem.

In this as sketched by Mr. Brightman in Appendix B. pp. 464 ff. we notice :

1. Lections and sermon before the catechumens withdraw.

2. A new point—a ceremonial hand washing previous to the Kiss of Peace.

3. The account of the Institution is not mentioned as recited and we know, as Mr. Brightman points out (p. 469), from the statements of St. Cyril elsewhere that he did not attach importance to the words of institution as a necessary part of the “form” of consecration.

He gives them briefly elsewhere (Lect. xxii.) thus :

“ In the night in which He was betrayed our Lord Jesus Christ took bread into His immaculate hands, and when He had given thanks He brake it and gave it to His disciples saying : ‘ Take, eat, this is My body.’ And taking the cup, He gave thanks and said : ‘ Take, drink, this is My blood which is shed for many for the remission of sins.’ ”

4. The Invocation is spoken of and it is said that we ask that the Holy Spirit may be sent forth on these (gifts) lying before Him that He may make (*īva ποιήσῃ*) the bread the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ. (N.B. *ποιήσῃ* not *ἀποφίνῃ* as in St. Clement.)

5. He calls the bread and wine after the invocation *τὴν πνευματικὴν θυσίαν* “the spiritual sacrifice” and *τὴν ἀναίμακτον λατρείαν* “the bloodless worship” and speaks of *τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης τοῦ ἵλασμοῦ* (“sacrifice of propitiation.”)

6. He says *աνημονεύομεν τῶν προκεκοιμημένων* and then implies that the Eucharist is offered for the departed.

7. Mention is made of prayers and intercession of the saints.

8. Mention is also made of the use of the Lord’s Prayer.

9. There is no explicit mention of elevation.

10. Before the Communion the choir were to sing :
“ Taste and see that the Lord is gracious.”

11. *θυσιαστήριον* (“ altar ”) is frequent.

12. There is a rubric which is noticeable :

“ Then come forward to the holy altar of God—do not come with your hands stretched out nor with the fingers open, but making with your right hand the left hand a throne as about to receive your king, and hollowing the palm, receive the body of Christ saying Amen. Then take the cup of the blood not stretching forth the hands but stooping, and with obeisance and reverence say, Amen.”

I have called this a rubric but perhaps that is hardly correct ; we might better have called it a rubrical direction of St. Cyril. Whether it was an actual rubric at this time or not is uncertain.

Of this sketched Liturgy we may say that there is undoubtedly a distinct development here ; and when compared with the Liturgy of St. Clement in the Apostolical Constitutions which is 4th century as this claims to be, we are struck by the contrast in many points. There is a distinct development of doctrine and some of the language is entirely new. It is only right to mention that it has been denied by “ our own learned Bishop Andrewes,” by the late Dean Goode and others that these catechetical lectures are really the work of St. Cyril. At any rate too much weight should not be attached to them as evidence of the Liturgy of Palestine at this date. Some points may have been the private opinion of St. Cyril or of the Pseudo-Cyril if these lectures be not the genuine work of St. Cyril himself.

We must next consider *The Liturgy of Antioch*, outlined from the writings of St. Chrysostom.

We shall again only note the salient and the additional points.

The following are to be noted :

1. Lections

- (a) *προφήτη*. (Prophet=O.T. Lesson)
- (b) *Απόστολος*. (Apostle=Our Epistle)
- (c) *εὐαγγέλιον*. (Gospel)

2. Sermon, followed by a sort of ascription.

3. Prayers for catechumens and dismissal.

Prayers for energouenoi and dismissal.

Prayers for penitents and dismissal.

Only the faithful now remain.

All sit.

1. Prayer for the whole world (with various intercessions).

All stand up.

2. The Kiss of Peace.

3. All but the faithful ordered to depart.

4. Faithful to stand.

5. Sursum Corda : "Lift up *τὸν νοῦν* ("mind") *καὶ τὰς καρδίας* ("and your hearts.") (The latter clause is new).

6. Thanksgiving.

7. "With Cherubim and Seraphim say Holy, Holy, Holy, heaven and earth are full of Thy glory," reminds us of familiar words in our own Church of England Liturgy.

8. *ἱερεὺς* ("sacrificing priest") is used but *τραπέζα* ("table") as well as *θυσιαστήριον* ("altar") (e.g. *ἔστηκε πρὸ τῆς τραπέζης*).

9. The Invocation is that "the Holy Spirit may come and touch the gifts lying before Him, that grace may fall on the sacrifice and through it kindle the souls of all and make them brighter than refined silver."

This is followed by the sign of the cross.

10. Intercessions including : "those who sleep in Christ."

11. Apparently the Agnus Dei was repeated.

(He says in one place : “ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν πρόσιμεν, δεόμενοι τοῦ ἀμνοῦ τοῦ κειμένου τοῦ λάβοντος τὴν ἀμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου.”) His words may not, of course, mean as much as this : they may only mean that prayer is offered to Christ as the Lamb slain ; but Brightman supposes a reference to the use of the Agnus Dei.

12. The Lord's Prayer was used.

13. There is a mention of manual acts (*ὅτι ερεὺς κλάτον ἄρτον*).

14. The doors are opened and the sacrifice brought forth ; the priest saying : “ Holy things for holy persons.”

15. A psalm is sung (presumably during communion).

16. There is mention of *ἡ ἐσχάτη εὐχαριστία*—the last thanksgiving.

17. The words of dismissal are :

“ Depart in peace.”

This sketch is derived from Brightman Appendix, C. pp. 470ff.

In Appendix D. pp. 481ff. Brightman gives a sketch of the *Syrian Liturgy from the Fifth to the Eighth Century*.

This sketch is compiled by Mr. Brightman from the writings of various authors of the period.

We shall notice again as before the salient points and any additional points.

1. There was added to the Syrian Rite “ The Entrance ” as it was called later, consisting of a prayer to the Trinity thus :

“ Holy God and Father, Holy, Mighty, Son of God, incarnate and crucified in the flesh for us. Holy, deathless, Holy Spirit, One Lord of Sabaoth, have mercy upon us.”

2. Lections confined to *ὁ Ἀπόστολος* and *τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον* ; our epistle and gospel.

3. Addition of the recital of the creed.
4. Use of sacred diptychs or lists of names for intercession.
5. Addition to 1 Cor. xi. 26 in the narrative of Institution of the words: "and confess His resurrection."
6. Invocation for the Holy Spirit "on us and on the gifts," that "He may hallow and make (*ἀγιάσῃ καὶ ποιήσῃ*) this bread the holy body of Christ and this cup the precious blood of Christ—that they may become to those who worthily and with faith partake, unto remission of sins, life eternal, and guarding of soul and body." (*ίνα γένηται τοῖς πίστει ἀξίως μεταλαμβάνοντιν εἰς ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον καὶ εἰς φυλακτήριον ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος*).
- Valuable as showing the meaning of the Invocation.
7. We have the phrase *τὴν θυσίαν ἐκείνην τὴν ἀναίμακτον* ("bloodless sacrifice,") evidently becoming an established phrase.
8. Elevation of the bread.
9. Burning in fire of the elements that remain unconsumed.

There remains now only to consider *The Byzantine Liturgy before the Seventh Century* as sketched in Brightman Appendix O. pp. 527ff.

Of this sketch Brightman says :

"The outline of the liturgy of the beginning of the 5th century can be gathered from St. Chrysostom's Constantinopolitan writings, but evidence has been added from other writers of the 5th century and of the 6th, the latter of whom at least represent in some points a usage later than St. Chrysostom. If the ritual of the two entrances and the creed be omitted and the offertory be inserted, probably after the Kiss of Peace, the result will represent approximately the rite of St. Chrysostom's date, (p. 530), and he adds

(p. 533) : "The custom of saying the anaphora inaudibly was gaining ground in the 6th century, for Justinian attempted to check it."

We shall note in this case only new points or additions to points already noticed.

1. Incense is in use (presumably only as a fumigatory before the service).

2. Just before the Kiss of Peace, after the opening prayers of the "Mass of the Faithful," as it is sometimes called later, the deacons bring in the bread and wine to the holy altar ($\tauῷ ἀγίῳ θυσιαστηρίῳ$) and place them on the table ($ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν$). This was afterwards called : "The Great Entrance."

3. Special mention is made of the Diptychs :

- (a) $\tauῶν κεκοιμημένων$ (of the departed) ;
- (b) $\tauῶν ζώντων$ (of the living.)

4. We have a word for "consecrate" ($\alphaὐδεῖξε$ and $\alphaὐδεῖξας τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ$). This, Brightman points out, is not in the Basilian form of the 9th century, but is found in the Liturgy of St. James.

5. Mention is made of the uplifted hand when saying : "Holy things to holy persons."

6. Any remaining elements are now consumed ($κατεσθίειν$).

Traces of the *Egyptian Liturgy of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries* are found in the Egyptian Fathers. Mr. Brightman has sketched the Liturgy from these sources as far as this can be done, in Appendix J. (pp. 504f.) He says : "The writers (*i.e.*, from whom the sketch is composed) belong mostly to the 4th and 5th centuries, while two are of the 3rd, one of the 6th and one of the 7th. No one writer gives much information" (p. 506).

We need only notice four points :

1. Hallowing of bread and cup by invocation and descent of the Holy Spirit.

2. No specific rubric for elevation.
3. No intercession for departed.
4. Consumption of elements left by the clergy and if necessary faithful brethren.

There are also traces of the Liturgy of Asia from the Canons of Laodicea 363 A.D., given by Mr. Brightman in Appendix M. but these are so scanty and contain no new points and need not therefore detain us further.

It may be well to note here that the Liturgies often called "The Early Liturgies," *i.e.*, St. James, St. Mark, St. Chrysostom and St. Basil, are *not* really *early*. They are all later in their present form than the 6th century. St. James in its present form dates from the 10th or 11th century; St. Mark in its present form from the 12th century; (though both these are mentioned by name in the Canons of the Council in Trullo 692, but how far in their present form cannot of course be determined). St. Basil and St. Chrysostom belong to the 9th century in their present form.

In the West the traces of a liturgy before the 7th or 8th century are so vague and scanty that though we infer its existence at least in the 5th century, there are not sufficient traces to enable us to form any conception of the doctrinal teaching it contained.

It might be well, perhaps, before continuing the investigation as to the Teaching of the Primitive Church, to pause here and give a *Summary of the Teaching of the Ancient Liturgies* which we have *just considered*, as far as it can be gathered.

1. Simplicity is certainly a marked feature in these early ages, especially in the earliest portion of the period. Towards the close of the period we can detect perhaps the coming of greater elaborateness in the ceremonial accompaniments.

2. The idea of remembrance is certainly a feature of the early rites, *e.g.*, in Clementine Liturgy, also hints

in Justin Martyr, though perhaps not specially emphasized.

3. The idea of Spiritual Feeding is present in almost all.

4. Thanksgiving is a prominent feature—thanksgiving both for the blessings of Providence and of Redemption. A very long thanksgiving prayer seems to have been a feature of all early rites.

5. The union of believers is typified by the “one loaf.” This at least is clearly emphasized in the Didaché.

6. The following are the qualifications for reception :

1. Faith.
2. Baptism.
3. Holiness.
4. Love.

7. As to the Presence in the Lord’s Supper. It is difficult to form an exact conception of the teaching of these early liturgies on this point. As we have seen only one liturgy is in its complete form, the Clementine, though the sketch given in the Didaché is fairly full, as is also the sketch in Justin. We shall be better able to formulate a statement on this point when we have considered the teaching of the Early Fathers on the subject before us.

From the liturgies or sketches of liturgies considered above, we gather this :

There is no explicit statement of any change in the substance of the elements or of any Presence in those elements. Indeed it is evident that for much of this period no special virtue was believed to attach to what we now call “the words of consecration,” used by our Lord at the original Lord’s Supper. In the Didaché the words of Institution are not found, nor are they in the Liturgy of the Assyrian or Nestorian Christians,

which is of a very ancient date. St. Cyril of Jerusalem does not mention them as recited in his day and we know from his own statements that he did not attach importance to them as a necessary part of the "form" of consecration. At the same time there is an Invocation that the Holy Spirit may make the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ, but as we gather from the Clementine Liturgy and the sketch of the Syrian Liturgy of Centuries 5—8, this was not intended to imply any change in the *substance* of the elements. In the Clementine Liturgy the word is ἀποφήνῃ (*ὅπως ἀποφήνῃ*) and this need mean no more than that the Holy Spirit may reveal and declare what the sacred elements are *to the faithful*; and this view is supported by the sketch of the Syrian Liturgy above mentioned, where, after the statement that the Holy Spirit is invoked to hallow and make the elements the Body and Blood of Christ, we read in further explanation "that they may become to those who worthily and with faith partake, unto remission of sins," etc.

Justin Martyr's words about the elements not being "*common food*," etc., need signify, as we have already seen, no more than a change in character, operation and effect.

At the same time it must be admitted that sacrificial terms, as applied to the Lord's Supper and to various things and persons connected with its administration, are beginning during the close of this period to get firmly established, though we must remember that the phrases : "bloodless worship," and "sacrifice of propitiation," attributed to St. Cyril of Jerusalem, may not be his at all, but may belong to a later date, and the phrase : "bloodless sacrifice," in the sketch of the Syrian Liturgy is from a writer of the end of the 6th or perhaps even of the 7th century. Taking the period as a whole so far as we have considered it, there

is nothing to warrant reading into the sacrificial terms such as *θυσία*, *θυσιαστήριον* and *ἱερεύς*, which undoubtedly do occur all the later meaning that has attached itself to them.

Towards the close of the period there seems to be distinct traces of elevation, but whether in the full later sense is perhaps doubtful. There certainly appears to be mention of an offering of the Lord's Supper on behalf of the departed in the Clementine Liturgy and elsewhere, but exactly how it was supposed to benefit the departed we are not told.

We might mention before we leave this portion of our subject that the service during this period included prayers for Christ's Church and various classes of persons in or connected with that Church as enquirers or catechumens, etc; public confession of sin; the Lord's Prayer; instruction (lections and sermon.)

Also that there was probably a weekly celebration and that the actual Communion service proper was confined to the faithful, all others being commanded to depart.

CHAPTER II—(*continued*)

We pass now to the consideration of *the Teaching of the Fathers* during these *first six centuries*.

Before we deal with this matter it is well to observe that “the Fathers spoke with less care and precision than subsequent errors and heresies would have rendered necessary at a later period,” (the late Dean Goode) and “did not trouble themselves with denying that (*i.e.*, later developments of Eucharistic doctrine) which they did not believe anyone to hold.” (Meyrick). This is true of other subjects than the one before us. It must also be remembered that their language is also often very highly rhetorical and the opinions of one or two of the Fathers, or even of several of them, on any matter must not necessarily have been the opinion of the whole Church of their day.

The teaching of the Fathers on the subject before us has been very fully gone into, on the one hand by Dr. Pusey (“*Doctrine of the Real Presence*,”) and on the other by Dr. Harrison (“*Whose are the Fathers?*”), Dr. Hebert (“*The Lord’s Supper—Uninspired Teaching*,”) and Dean Goode (“*Nature of Christ’s Presence in the Eucharist*.”)

It is not my purpose to do what has already been so well done, and to deal with all the statements of the Fathers on this subject, but only to indicate certain general conclusions that may be gathered from the teaching of the leading Fathers.

I. The Fathers considered the bread and wine in the Lord’s Supper to be still bread and wine after

consecration, and did not consider them to be changed in substance ; though, as being symbols, signs, and figures of the Body and Blood of Christ, they often dignified them with the name of that which they symbolized and represented.

A few passages will make this clear.

1. *St. Chrysostom* in a letter which he wrote to Caesarius against the heresy of the Apollinarians says :

“ Before the consecration of the bread we call it bread, but when by the priest’s action the grace of God has sanctified it, it loses the name of bread and is counted worthy to be called the Lord’s Body, *although the nature of bread continues in it.*” (p. 137, ed. Wake).

The genuineness of this Epistle, though called in question by some Romanists, rests on as good authority as that of any of the other works of Chrysostom.

2. *St. Augustine* says :

“ Sacraments are signs of realities, being one thing and signifying something else.” (Contra Maximin. ii. 22.)

And again :

“ If sacraments had not a certain similitude to those things of which they are sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all. But from this *similitude*, they for the most part receive the names even of the things themselves.” (Ep. ad Boniface Episc. ep. 98.)

And again :

“ The Lord hesitated not to say : ‘ This is My body ’ when He was giving a *sign* of His body.” (Contra Adimantum c. xii. sect. 3.)

3. *Theodoret* has left us among his works a remarkable discussion between an orthodox believer and a Eutychian. The Eutychian heresy was that after His incarnation, the nature of our Lord was but one, His human nature being merged in the Divine nature. The

Eutychian argues for his tenet from the Holy Communion, inasmuch as after consecration, he says, the bread ceases to be bread and becomes the body of Christ. The orthodox answers him: "You are caught in the net that you have made yourself. For the mystic symbols do *not* depart from their own nature after consecration, but *remain of the same substance* and shape and form, and are visible and tangible, just as they were before." (Dial. ii.).

The above paragraph (3) is quoted extenso from Meyrick "Doctrine of the Holy Communion," p. 129.

We may also add another passage from Theodoret (Dial. i.):

"He (our Lord) honoured the visible symbols with the appellation of His Body and Blood, *not having changed their nature*, but having added grace to nature."

4. *Gelasius* (circa 480 A.D.) writes :

"Certainly the sacraments which we receive of the Body and Blood of Christ are Divine things by which we are made partakers of the Divine nature and yet *the substance or nature of bread and wine does not cease*," and adds that "the elements remain in their own proper nature." (De duab. nat. in Christo.)

5. *Facundus*, Bishop of Hermiana, (circa 540) is most emphatic on this point. He says :

"The sacrament of adoption may be called adoption ; as we call the sacrament of His Body and Blood, which is in the consecrated bread and cup, His Body and Blood ; *not that the bread is properly His Body and the cup His Blood* ; but because they contain in themselves the mystery of His Body and Blood. Hence also the Lord Himself called the bread and cup He had blessed, which He gave to His disciples, His body and blood." (De Defens. trium. Capit. lib. ix. c. 5.)

The passages in which the Fathers speak of the

consecrated sacramental elements as “ figures, symbols, signs,” are too numerous to enumerate in full.

One such passage from Augustine has already been quoted above, *i.e.*, “ The Lord did not hesitate to say : ‘ This is My Body,’ when He gave the *sign* of His Body.”

Similarly *Tertullian* : “ He made the bread that He took and distributed to His disciples His own body by saying : ‘ This is My body, that is a *figure* of My body.’ ” (adv. Marc. iv. 40.) And *Origen* calls the bread : “ *the typical and symbolical body.* ” (Comm. in Matt., tom. xi. sect. 14.)

So also *Ephraem Syrus* : “ Observe how, blessing the bread, He breaks it to be *a type of His* own immaculate body ; and the cup also, how He blesses it to be *a type of His* blood, and gives them to His disciples.” (Tract “ De iis qui filii Dei naturam scrutantur.”)

So *Eusebius of Caesarea* : “ He delivered to His disciples *the symbols* of the Divine dispensation, ordering them to be made *a representation* of His own body.” (Demonstr. Evang. lib. i. c. 10.)

And *St. Chrysostom* says :

“ If Jesus did not die, of what are the consecrated elements *the symbols.* ” (In Matt. tom. lxxxii. sect. 1.)

At the same time the Fathers often called the bread and wine Christ’s Body and Blood, on the principle given us by St. Augustine : “ A thing which is a sign is accustomed to be called by the name of the thing which it signifies.” (Quaest. in Levit. lib. iii. q. 57.)

This custom of the Fathers is noticed by Bishop Cosin in his History of Transubstantiation (English Trans. c. vi. sect. 8) where he says that the Fathers “ spake of the signs as if they had been the thing signified,” and called “ sensible things by the name of those spiritual things which they seal and signify.”

II. In the opinion of the Fathers there was no

identification of the sign with the thing signified : the two were distinct. The “ sacramentum ” may be partaken of without the “ res sacramenti ; ” not all who received the one of necessity received the other, which must necessarily be the case if there was a whole or partial identification of the sign and the thing signified.

Some of the passages already quoted bear out the first part of this statement.

Further :

St. Augustine most clearly says :

“ The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ is taken by some to life, by some to destruction ; but the thing itself, of which it is a sacrament, is to every man for life, to none for destruction whosoever may be partaker of it.” (In *Johan.* tract. xxvi. 15.)

And again :

“ He that dwelleth not in Christ and in whom Christ dwelleth not, beyond doubt neither eats His flesh, nor drinks His blood, although he eat and drink the sacrament of so great a thing to his condemnation.” (In *Johan.* tract. xxvi. sect. 18.)

Origen on the same point writes :

“ Concerning the Word Himself Who became flesh and true food, which he who eats shall altogether live for ever, no wicked person being able to eat of it. For if it were possible that one still remaining wicked could eat Him Who became flesh, being the Word and the Living Bread, it would not have been written that everyone that eateth this bread shall live for ever.” (In *Matt.* tom. xi. sect. 14.)

And again :

“ No wicked soul can eat the holy flesh of the Word of God.” (In *Levit.* hom. iv. sect. 8.)

Jerome says that they “ who are lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God,” and “ eat the meats of

wickedness," do not "eat the flesh of Jesus nor drink His blood," (Comm. in Is. c. lxvi. v. 17,) and again that "heretics do not eat the flesh of Christ, Whose flesh is the food of believers." (Comm. in Hos. c. viii. v. 12.)

III. According to the Fathers it is by faith that we are incorporated into Christ.

St. Augustine says : "By faith we are united to the Body of Christ." (In Johann. Ev. tract. xxvii. sect. 7.)

St. Cyril of Alexandria writes :

"But He (*i.e.*, Christ) is wholly introduced into us by the Holy Spirit," and again : "The Son of God takes up His abode in us by faith." (Comm. in Johann. lib. ii.).

St. Chrysostom speaks of faith as that "by which we subsist and were born, and so to speak were made of one body with Him." (In Ep. ad Hebr. hom. vi. sect. 1.)

This, in the opinion of the Fathers, is the means of our incorporation with Him, *i.e.*, faith. It is not due to any bodily conjunction of our bodies with His by our eating His body with our mouths in the Eucharist.

IV. The Fathers also maintain that we are incorporated into Christ by baptism, if it is received "in a sound state of mind," *i.e.*, with true faith. And therefore, as Dean Goode points out : "So far from attributing our incorporation into Christ to our bodily reception of His real Body and Blood, they say that we are so incorporated before we receive the Eucharist, and that we come to it as men already belonging to and forming part of that body of Christ of which we are called to partake in that holy rite."

St. Augustine says :

"By baptism men are buried with Christ, that they

may be incorporated into Him as His members, that is, His faithful ones." (De pecc. mer. et remiss. lib. i. c. 26.)

St. Chrysostom writes :

" How then are we ' of His flesh and of His bones ? ' because as he was born of the Holy Spirit without bodily conjunction, so are we also in the laver." (In Ephes. hom. xx. sect. 3.)

Fulgentius says :

" No one of the faithful ought to be anxious respecting those who, although they are rightly baptized, in a sound state of mind, yet, through death taking them off suddenly, are not permitted to eat the flesh of the Lord and drink His blood ; on account namely of that saying of the Saviour in which He said : ' Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, etc.' For whoever will consider this not merely according to the mysteries of the truth, but according to the truth of the mystery, will see at once that this took place in the very laver of holy regeneration. For what is done in the sacrament of holy Baptism, but that *believers* are made members of our Lord Jesus Christ, and belong to the communion of His body by ecclesiastical unity ? " And further down he says that " by the regeneration of holy baptism He becomes that which He is about to take from the sacrifice of the altar." (Epist. ad Ferrand. ep. xii. ch. 11.)

V. The Fathers speak of the Lord's Supper and baptism in exactly the same way. Language parallel to that used by them in reference to the Lord's Supper, and supposed by some to imply a real objective presence of Christ, " in, with, or under " the consecrated bread and wine is used by them in reference to baptism, where such language confessedly does not imply such a presence.

St. Cyril of Alexandria says that " the Son of God

Himself invisibly floats upon the waters of the holy font." (In *Johan.* lib. vi.)

So *Origen* speaks of the laver of regeneration as being "the wine of His blood," (In *Gen. hom. xvii.* sect. 8); and *Jerome* (speaking of the Ethiopian eunuch) says "being immediately baptized in the blood of the lamb of which he was reading." (Com. in *Is. lib. xiv.* in c. 53.)

And *Augustine* says :

" You are washed with the blood of Christ, when you are baptized in His death." (Serm. de quart. fer c. 2.)

V. When the Fathers speak of a change in the consecrated elements it is not a change of substance that is intended (see testimonies above under I.) but one of efficacy and use.

Thus *St. Cyril of Alexandria* speaks of God imparting "to the substances on the table, the power of life," and changing them "into the efficacy of His own flesh." (Comm. in *Luc. c. xxii. v. 19.*)

Theodore (in a passage already quoted under I.) says that Christ "honoured the visible symbols with the name of His body and blood, not having changed their nature, but having added grace to nature."

And *Gregory of Nyssa* writes :

" The bread is originally common bread, but when the mystery has consecrated it, it is called and becomes the body of Christ. Thus the mystic oil, thus the wine, though they are of little value previous to the benediction, after the sanctification which proceeds from the Spirit, each of them works in a superior way." (In *Baptism. Christi*, quoted in *Goode on Eucharist* vol. i. pp. 399—400.)

Here, perhaps, we may conveniently note that the Fathers occasionally use the word "transmade," (*μεταποιεῖσθαι*) and "transelementing" (*μεταστοιχειοῦσθαι*) of the elements in the Lord's Supper. Of the

former Dean Goode points out that Dr. Pusey said : " it does not in any way specially denote any material change," and of the latter the same writer said that it is used " to designate change of condition or virtue, not of substance." (See Goode, vol. i. p. 412.)

VII. That the Fathers held that there was a presence in the elements of the Body and Blood of Christ, whether of the material body, or of what is sometimes called a " spiritual body " seems incompatible with their clear language as to the absence of Christ from earth as regards His human nature ; and as to the Risen Body of Christ being only able to be in one place at a time.

(a) As to absence of Christ from earth as regards His human nature,

Origen says :

" According to the nature of His Divinity He is not absent, but He is absent according to the dispensation of the body which He took." (In Matt. Com. sect. 65.)

And *Augustine* writes :

" He is everywhere by that which is God, but He is in heaven by that which is man." (Lib. ad Dardanum seu Epist. 187, ch. 3.)

St. Cyril of Alexandria says :

" He is now absent from the world as far as the flesh is concerned." (Comm. in Joann. lib. 6, c. ix. v. 5.)

And again :

" His Spirit fills the place of the presence and the power of Christ." (Comm. in Joann. lib. 10, c. xiv. v. 26.)

And again :

" He is present with us ; He has not left us desolate ; but has sent us *instead of Himself*, the Comforter, and by Him is present to those that love Him." (Comm. in Zachar. in c. viii. v. 7.)

Such a passage as the following from *St. Chrysostom* (Comm. in 1 Cor. hom. 28, in c. xi. v. 29) is quite irreconcilable with the notion of His holding a real bodily presence of our Lord in the Eucharistic elements.

He writes :

“ For as His presence which brought to us those great and unspeakable blessings, tended to the greater condemnation of those who did not receive it, so also the mysteries become the causes of greater punishment to those who unworthily partake of them.”

Commenting on this passage Dean Goode well says (p. 305) :

“ He could not thus have contrasted His ‘ presence ’ with ‘ the mysteries ’ if His real bodily presence were vouchsafed in the mysteries.”

Further, *St. Ambrose* wrote :

“ We ought not to seek Thee on the earth, nor in the earth, nor according to the flesh if we wish to find Thee.” (Expos. Evang. sec. Luc. Lib. x. sects. 159 and 160.)

And *Leo the Great* said :

“ Our Lord Jesus Christ being taken up into heaven in the sight of His disciples on the fortieth day after His resurrection terminated *His bodily presence*, being about to remain on the right hand of the Father until the times divinely foreappointed for multiplying the sons of the Church are fulfilled and He comes in the same flesh in which He ascended to judge the quick and the dead. Therefore what was the object of sight in our Redeemer has passed into sacraments ; and that faith might be more excellent and stable, *doctrine* has succeeded to vision, the authority of which the hearts of believers, illuminated by rays from above, might follow.” (Serm. 74, De ascens. Dom. 2, cap. 2.)

(b) As to the Risen Body of Christ being only able to be in one place at a time,

Augustine writes :

“As it respects this form (*i.e.*, of man) He is not to be supposed to be spread abroad everywhere. For we must take heed that we do not so maintain the Divinity of the man as to take away the truth of the body . . . He is everywhere by that which is God, but He is in heaven by that which is man.” (Lib. ad Dardanum seu. epist. 187, c. iii. or sect. 10.) And again (*ibid.*) :

“Doubt not that Christ is wholly present everywhere as God, and is in the same temple of God as indwelling God, and in some one place of heaven on account of the measure (or limit) of a true body.” (Lib. ad Dardanum c. xiii.)

Similarly *Vigilius, Bishop of Thapsus*, writes :

“When the flesh of Christ was upon earth, it was not in heaven ; and now since it is in heaven, it is not on earth . . . the word is everywhere, but His flesh is not everywhere . . . He is everywhere according to the nature of His Divinity and is contained within a place according to the nature of His humanity . . . He is circumscribed by place by the nature of His flesh, and is not limited by place by the nature of His Divinity.” (Contra Eutych. lib. iv. c. 4.)

And *Fulgentius* gives testimony to the same effect : Christ is in heaven “according to His human substance,” and *Fulgentius* asks :

“How is He present to His faithful ones except as the infinite and true God?” (Ad Thrasimund. lib. ii. c. 17.)

Such language as we have quoted above seems totally irreconcilable with a belief in a localized presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, and even

with a belief in the presence in or with the elements of a "spiritual" or "glorified" body of Christ as it is called.

As to the latter *Theodoret* says quite clearly :

"The body of the Lord arose indeed incorruptible and impassible and immortal, and glorified with Divine glory, and is worshipped by the heavenly powers ; but nevertheless it is a body *having its former circumscription.*" (Dial. 2, *Inconfusus*, cited in *Goode* "on Eucharist," p. 316.)

VIII. The Fathers hold that believers feed upon the flesh and blood of Christ, not only in the Lord's Supper but also in baptism and in various religious exercises.

Thus *Fulgentius* (in a passage quoted above under IV.) :

"No one of the faithful ought to be anxious respecting those who, although they are rightly baptized in a sound state of mind, yet through death taking them off suddenly, are not permitted to eat the flesh of the Lord and to drink His blood (*i.e.*, in the Lord's Supper) ; on account namely of that saying of the Saviour in which He said : 'Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man,' etc. For whoever will consider this not merely according to the mysteries of the truth but according to the truth of the mysteries, will see at once that this took place in the very laver of holy regeneration."

And *Jerome* writes :

"Moreover, inasmuch as the flesh of the Lord is the true food, and His blood is the true drink, by legitimate consequence, this is the only good we have in the present world, namely, to feed upon His flesh and drink His blood, *not only in the sacrament but also in the reading of the Scriptures.* For the true meat and drink which is taken from the word of God is the knowledge of the *Scriptures.*" (Comm. in *Eccles.* c. iii.).

IX. Notice should also be taken of the fact that the Fathers do not contemplate an *oral* manducation of the body and blood of Christ by the communicants in the Lord's Supper, and hence they could not believe in a presence *in* the elements.

St. Augustine says :

"Why do you prepare your teeth and belly ? Believe and thou hast eaten." (In Johan. tract. xxv. sect. 12.)

And again :

"What is bread from the Kingdom of God, but He Who says, I am the Living bread which came down from heaven ? Prepare not your jaws but your heart. Herefrom is that supper given to us. Behold we believe in Christ, we take Him by faith" (some read "Whom we take by faith.") (Serm. 112, sect. 5.)

St. Augustine here gives no hint that he knows of any distinction such as between an oral manducation of the body of Christ present in its natural form after a material manner and an oral manducation of that body present in a supernatural form like a spirit.

How indeed an oral manducation of the latter kind can take place at all passes comprehension.

We may conclude the consideration of the Teaching of the Fathers by quoting the words of Hooker (Eccles. Polity Book V. ch. 67.) :

"In a word," he says, "it appeareth not that of all the ancient Fathers of the Church anyone did ever conceive or imagine other than only a mystical participation of Christ's both body and blood in the Sacrament ; neither are their speeches concerning the change of the elements themselves into the body and blood of Christ such that a man can thereby in conscience assure himself it was their meaning to persuade the world, either of a corporal consubstantiation of Christ with those sanctified and blessed elements

before we receive them, or of the like transubstantiation of them into the body and blood of Christ."

SUMMARY OF THE TEACHING OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH AS GATHERED FROM THE ANCIENT LITURGIES AS FAR AS THEY CAN BE TRACED, AND FROM THE WORDS OF THE FATHERS.

As the Liturgies enabled us to emphasize the positive side of the Teaching of the Primitive Church, we have, in considering the opinions of the Fathers, rather laid the stress on the negative side in view of later developments of Eucharistic Teaching. We may, of course, take it for granted that the positive teaching of the Liturgies and liturgical sketches (gathered as the latter are from the writings of the Fathers themselves) is also the Teaching of the Fathers.

Putting the two side by side in parallel columns we have at a glance a fairly full summary of the Teaching of the Primitive Church (*i.e.*, of the Church of the first six centuries).

CHURCH OF THE FIRST SIX CENTURIES

LITURGICAL FORMS.

1. Simplicity.
2. Remembrance.
3. Spiritual Feeding.
4. Thanksgiving.
5. Union of Believers.
6. Qualifications.
 1. Faith.
 2. Baptism.
 3. Holiness.
 4. Love
7. No explicit statement of any change in the substance of the bread and wine; or of any presence *in* the consecrated elements. Nothing to warrant more than change in character, operation and effect. It is true that sacrificial terms are used, but there is nothing to suggest their use in the fuller meaning that has attached itself to them in later times.

FATHERS.

Feeding by Believers. No *oral* manducation.

By Faith we are incorporated into Christ, whether in the Sacraments or through any other means of grace.

The bread and wine remain still bread and wine after consecration. There is no change in their substance. They are symbols, signs and figures, though they are often, because of this, called by the name of that which they symbolize or represent. There is no identification of the sign with the thing signified. The "Sacramentum" may be partaken of without the "res sacramenti". Not all who receive the one of necessity receive the other. The wicked do not receive the "res sacramenti" at all. There is no knowledge of any real objective presence in the elements whether of a material or "glorified" body of Christ. The language used as to the bodily absence of Christ as to His human nature: and as to the Risen Body of the Lord being only able to be in one place at one time, absolutely preclude such an idea.

The only change known of is one of efficacy and use.

CHAPTER III

“THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ROME”

Our next subject for consideration is :

“THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.”

Our authorities for the Teaching of the Church of Rome are :

1. The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent.
2. The Creed of Pope Pius IV.
3. The Catechism of the Council of Trent issued in 1566 by Pope Pius V.
4. The Roman Canon of the Mass.

We shall consider first the Canon of the Mass and preface this by a brief sketch of Mass in the Roman Church.

The priest officiates at the altar, clad in the Eucharistic vestments (amice, alb, girdle, maniple, stole, and chasuble), assisted at High Mass by the deacon clad in Dalmatic and the subdeacon in Tunicle.

The celebration of Mass is thus divided :

- I. Ordinarium Missae.
- II. Canon Missae.

In giving this sketch I have availed myself of the text as given in Maskell, “Antient Liturgy of the Church of England,” pp. 3ff., and in Dr. Wright’s “Service of the Mass in Greek and Roman Churches,” pp. 46ff.

I. ORDINARIUM MISSAE.

1. *General Preparation.* This takes place at the foot of the altar. The priest places the chalice and paten on the altar and covers them with the pall, then goes back to the bottom of the altar steps and having bowed towards the altar signs himself with the sign of the cross and begins : "In the name of the Father, etc." Then with hands joined before his breast he exclaims : "I will go to the altar of God." The response made to this is in the words of the same verse (Ps. xlvi. 4. Douay Version : A.V. xlvi. 4.)

2. *Antiphon.* The whole Psalm is then repeated alternately by the priest and his attendants.

The priest having bowed lowly, with joined hands, then makes his confession as follows :

3. *Confiteor.* "I confess to Almighty God, to the Blessed Mary Virgin, etc., and to you, brethren, that I have grievously sinned in thought, word and deed (he then smites upon his breast saying) my fault, my fault, my greatest fault. Therefore I pray the Blessed Mary ever Virgin, blessed Michael, etc., and you, brethren, to pray for me to the Lord our God." Then the attendants and the people reply :

4. *Misereatur.* "May Almighty God have mercy on thee, and having pardoned thy sins may He bring thee to life eternal."

The priest says Amen, and rises.

The people then make their confession in similar language and the priest absolves with the same absolution in the plural form ("you" for "thee," "your" for "thy.")

Then making the sign of the cross he adds :

5. *Indulgenciam.* " May the Lord, Almighty and Merciful, grant to us indulgence, absolution, and remission of our sins." Amen.

Several versicles and responses are then repeated. Then the priest engages in private prayer, or rather in silent prayer.

6. *Secret Prayer.* " Take away from us O Lord, we beseech Thee, our iniquities, etc.

Then with hands joined upon the altar and body bent, he says : " We beseech Thee, O Lord, by the merits of Thy saints (here he kisses the altar in the middle) whose relics are here, and of all Thy saints that Thou wouldest pardon all my sins. Amen.

7. In a solemn Mass incense is blessed at this point ; the celebrant censing the altar and being then censed himself by the deacon. Then the celebrant, singing himself with the sign of the cross, begins the Introit.

8. *The Introit.* Which consists of verses from Psalms, etc., and closes with *Kyrie eleison* (3), *Christe eleison* (3), *Kyrie eleison* (3). Then the priest standing at the middle of the altar says or sings :

9. *The Gloria in Excelsis.* " Glory be to God on high and on earth peace, etc.

He then kisses the altar, and afterwards salutes the people with the words : " The Lord be with you," to which they reply : " And with thy spirit."

10. *The Collect for the Day and Epistle.* Then follows the Collect for the Day and the Epistle.

11. *The Gradual.* This is followed by the Gradual verses or responses, which vary with the day and are sung at this point, followed if time allows by the Tract (a sort of anthem) and the Alleluia.

This is followed by the placing (with much ceremony and various prayers) of the Book of the Gospels on the altar and the subsequent carrying of it with incense and lights to the Gospel side of the altar where the book
12. *The Gospel.* is censed thrice and the Gospel read.

Then comes

13. *The Sermon* (if there be one.)

Followed by

14. *The Nicene Creed.*

15. *The Offertory.* The priest then spreads upon the altar the cloth called the corporal and is presented by the deacon with the paten and wafer. The priest, elevating the wafer in offering to God, prays as follows : “ Receive, Holy Father, Omnipotent Eternal God, this immaculate host which I, Thine unworthy servant, offer to Thee, my God, the living and the true, for the innumerable sins and offences and negligences of mine, and on behalf of all standing by, and for all faithful Christians, living and dead, in order that may be profitable for mine and their salvation unto life eternal. Amen.”

Then making the sign of the cross, he places the wafer upon the corporal. Wine is then brought by the deacon, and water by the subdeacon, ceremonially mixed and offered with the prayer : “ O God, Who, in creating human nature, didst wonderfully dignify it, and hast more wonderfully renewed it ; grant to us, by the mystery of this water and wine, to be partakers of His divinity Who vouchsafed to become a partaker of our humanity, Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord, etc.”

The priest then takes the chalice and going to the middle of the altar elevates and offers up the wine in the words : “ We offer unto Thee, O Lord, the chalice of salvation, beseeching Thy clemency, that in the

sight of Thy Divine Majesty it may ascend with the odour of sweetness for our salvation and for that of the whole world." Having made the sign of the cross with the chalice and placing it upon the corporal, and covering it up with the pall, with hands joined upon the altar, bending down, he prays that the sacrifice may be acceptable to God. Then rising, elevating his eyes to heaven and stretching out his hands he says :

" Come, O Sacrificer, Almighty Eternal God and bless †this sacrifice prepared to Thy holy name."

The priest then blesses incense and proceeds to cense the oblations and the altar with accompanying prayers. He then ceremonially washes his fingers; repeating as he does so Psalm xxvi. 6—12, closing with " Glory to the Father, etc."

Then bowing before the altar he says :

" Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation which we make to Thee in memory (ob memoriam) of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of Jesus Christ our Lord, and in honour of the Blessed Mary ever Virgin, of blessed John Baptist, the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and of these and of all the saints, that it may be available to their honour and salvation, and may they vouchsafe to intercede for us in heaven whose memory we celebrate on earth."

Then turning to the people the priest says :

" Pray, brethren, that my sacrifice and yours may be acceptable to God the Father Almighty," to which the response is given :

" May the Lord receive the sacrifice from thy hands, to the praise and glory of His name and to our benefit and to that of all His Holy Church."

The priest then says : " Let us pray," and recites in a low voice :

16. *The Secreta.* the Secreta, or Secret Prayers, closing audibly with " world without

end," to which the people reply
Amen.

Then follows the *Sursum Corda*.

17. *Sursum Corda*. "Lift up your hearts, etc.

The *Gratias Agamas*:

18. *Gratias agamus*. "Let us give thanks to Thee, our God. It is meet and right," and the *vere dignum et justum*: "It

19. *Vere dignum et justum*; is very meet and right, etc." Which is further followed by the *Sanctus*:

20. *The Sanctus*. "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Sabaoth, etc."

At these words the priest lowers his voice and bows down profoundly, a bell is rung to call the attention of the people, and the priest kisses the altar, and turning to the people, signs himself with the sign of the cross, exclaiming: "Hosanna in the highest; blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord, hosanna in the highest."

Here the *Ordinarium Missae* or first portion of the service ends.

Now commences:

II. THE CANON MISSAE, the most important part of the service.

The priest, having bowed lowly before the altar, with hands clasped and resting on it, says:

"We therefore humbly pray and beseech Thee, most merciful Father, through Jesus Christ, Thy Son our Lord (kissing the altar), that Thou wouldest vouchsafe to accept (hands joined, and three signs of the cross over the oblations) and bless these gifts, these presents, these holy unspotted sacrifices (prayers continued with hands stretched out) which in the first place we offer to Thee for Thy Holy Catholic Church for . . . (here special mention is made of Pope, bishop, etc.)

And then follows the Commemoratio pro vivis :

“ Remember, O Lord, Thy servants and Thine handmaidens (names are mentioned of those for whom special prayer is made).”

Then with outstretched hands the priest proceeds to pray for all present : “ for whom we offer, or who offer to Thee, this sacrifice of praise (sacrificium laudis) communicating with and honouring the memory of the glorious ever Virgin Mary the blessed apostles and martyrs, etc., and of all Thy saints by whose merits and prayers grant that we may be always defended by the help of Thy protection, through the same Christ our Lord, Amen.”

The priest then again prays for the acceptance of the oblation, holding his hands spread over the oblations : “ We beseech Thee, O Lord that Thou will be pleased to accept this oblation,” and continues : “ which oblation do Thou, O God, vouchsafe in all things to make (three signs of the cross over the oblations) bles~~H~~sed, appro~~H~~ved, rati~~H~~fied, reasonable and acceptable (one sign of the cross over the host and one over the chalice), that it may become to us the bo~~H~~dy and blo~~H~~od of Thy most beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord (“ ut nobis cor~~H~~pus et San~~H~~guis fiat,” etc), Who on the day before He suffered (takes the host) took bread into His holy and venerable hands (raises his eyes to heaven), and with eyes raised to heaven, giving thanks to Thee, God His Father Omnipotent (signs over the host) bles~~H~~sed, broke and gave to His disciples saying : ‘ Take and eat ye all of this (holding the host with both hands between his first fingers and thumbs, he utters the words of consecration secretly, distinctly and attentively) Hoc est enim corpus meum. For this is My body.’ ”

Having pronounced the words of consecration, kneeling, he immediately adores the host, rises, shows

it to the people. At the elevation of the host a bell is rung thrice and the people prostrate themselves in "most profound adoration, in body and soul, of the most awful and august presence of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, under the sacramental veils."

The priest replaces the host upon the corporal, again adores it, keeping his thumbs and first fingers united, unless when the host has to be touched, until the washing of the fingers.

Then, having uncovered the chalice, he says :

" In like manner also after He had supped (takes the chalice with both hands), taking also this glorious chalice in His holy and venerable hands, and also giving thanks to Thee (holding the chalice with his left hand, with his right hand he signs over it) bles~~s~~sed, and gave it to His disciples saying : ' Take ye and drink ye all of it,' (he utters the words of consecration over the chalice, holding it a little elevated) ' for this is the chalice of My blood, of the new and eternal testament ; the mystery of faith ; which shall be shed (effundetur) for the remission of sins.' "

Then, having pronounced the words of consecration, the priest lays down the chalice upon the corporal, saying also secretly :

" As often as ye shall do these things ye shall do them in remembrance of me."

Then the priest kneeling down adores the chalice and rising elevates it, while the bell again is rung three times, and the people prostrate themselves in adoration. The priest then puts down the chalice, covers it, and again adores it. Then with hands unclasped he says :

" Wherefore, O Lord, we Thy servants, and also Thy holy people calling to mind the blessed passion of the same Christ Thy Son our Lord, with His resurrection from hell, and also His glorious ascension into

heaven, offer unto Thy excellent Majesty from Thy gifts and grants (he clasps hands, and signs thrice on the host and chalice together) a pure host, a holy host, immaculate host (signs once on the host, and once on the chalice), the holy bread of eternal life, and the chalice of everlasting salvation.”

With hands outstretched he proceeds :

“ Upon which things vouchsafe to look with a propitious and serene countenance, and to accept them, as Thou wert graciously pleased to accept the gifts of Thy Servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and that which Thy high priest Melchisedech offered to Thee, a holy sacrifice, an immaculate host.”

Then bowing profoundly and with hands joined and placed upon the altar, he says :

“ We most humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, command these things to be carried by the hands of Thy holy angel to Thy altar on high, in the sight of Thy Divine Majesty ; that as many of us (he kisses the altar) as by participation at this altar shall receive the most sacred (he joins hands and signs once upon the host and once upon the chalice) body and blood of Thy Son (signs himself) may be filled with all heavenly benediction and grace, through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.”

Then comes the Commemoratio pro defunctis :

“ Remember also, O Lord, Thy servants and thine handmaids (names mentioned) who have preceded us with the sign of faith and sleep in the sleep of peace.”

With joined hands the priest prays for the departed, then with outstretched hands, he continues :

“ We beseech Thee, that Thou wouldest grant them, O Lord, and all who rest in Christ, a place of refreshment, light and peace ; through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.”

Then striking his breast, and slightly raising his voice, he prays for “some part and fellowship with the holy apostles and martyrs (naming some of the latter), and with all Thy saints, into whose company we beseech Thee to admit us, not considering on merit, but freely pardoning our offences (clasps his hands) through Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom Thou dost always (signs thrice upon the host and chalice together saying) create, sanctify, vivify, bless and give to us all these good things. (He then uncovers the chalice, genuflects, takes the Sacrament with his right hand, holding the chalice with his left, signs thrice with the host from brim to brim of the chalice, saying:) through Himself, and with Himself, and in Himself (signs twice between the chalice and his breast) is to Thee, God the Father Omnipotent in the unity of the Holy Spirit (elevating a little the chalice with the host he says :) All honour and glory (replaces the host, covers the chalice, genuflects, rises and says :) for ever and ever Amen. Let us pray : instructed by Thy saving precepts, and following Thy Divine institution we presume to say (here he stretches out his hands) : — Our Father,” etc. The priest then says in a low voice : Amen.

He then takes the paten between his first and middle finger and says : “Deliver us, O Lord, from all ills, past, present, and to come, and by the intercession of the Blessed and Glorious Mary, ever Virgin, Mother of God, together with Thy blessed Apostles Peter and Paul and Andrew and all saints (signs himself with the paten from front to breast and kisses it), grant mercifully peace in our days, that assisted by the help of Thy mercy, we may be always free from sin and secure from all disturbance. . . . “He puts down the paten of the host, uncovers the chalice, genuflects, rises, takes the host, breaks it over the chalice, through the middle,

saying : " By the same Jesus Christ Thy Son our Lord." He then places upon the paten the part of the host which is in his right hand. Next of the part which remains in his left hand he breaks off a particle, saying : " Who liveth and reigneth with Thee in the unity of the Holy Spirit," places the other middle part upon the paten with his left hand and holding a particle over the chalice with his right, and the chalice in his left hand, says : " For ever and ever, Amen." With the same particle he signs three over the chalice, saying : " May the peace of the Lord be always with you." The people respond : " And with Thy spirit."

The priest then drops the same particle into the chalice, saying secretly :

" May this mixture and consecration of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ be to us that receive it effectual to eternal life. Amen."

The priest then covers the chalice, genuflects, rises, and having bowed to the Sacrament, with joined hands and smiting himself thrice on the breast, he says twice :

" Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us."

And once :

" Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, grant us peace."

Then having clasped his hands over the altar, and having again bowed to the host he says various prayers leading up to the words : " May the body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul to everlasting life. Amen."

And : " The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul to eternal life. Amen."

Then, as the rubric directs, " he takes the whole blood with the particle."

If there are any communicants they communicate at

this point, being communicated with the words : “The body our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul unto everlasting life. Amen.”

Just before the Communion of the people the priest, holding a host between his finger and thumb, turns to the people and elevating it, says : “Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world.” Then, as we have said, the people are communicated, if any communicate.

The priest performs the ablutions in the course of which he prays :

“ May Thy body, O Lord, which I have received, and Thy blood which I have drunk, cleave to my bowels (*adhaereat visceribus meis*) and grant that no stain of sins may remain in me who have been refreshed with pure and holy sacraments, Who livest and reignest for ever and ever. Amen.”

Then, after a few versicles :

“ *Ite missa est* ”

is then pronounced (“ Go, the mass is ended.”)

After this, from the middle of the altar, the priest recites a prayer commencing : “ O Holy Trinity let the performance of my homage be pleasing to Thee. .”

The priest then kisses the altar, raises his eyes, extending, raising and joining his hands, he bows his head to the Crucifix, and says :

“ May Almighty God bless you (and turning to the people) Father and Son ~~+~~ and Holy Spirit. Amen.”

Then going to the Gospel side of the altar, the last Gospel (as it is called) John i. 1—14 is read. At the words : “ The Word was made flesh,” the people kneel, the priest genuflects and at the close the people exclaim, “ Thanks be to God.”

COMMENTS ON THE SERVICE OF THE MASS

of which we have just given the sketch.

One rises from a perusal of the Roman service with the conviction burnt into one's mind that one has been breathing an atmosphere absolutely and totally different from that of the liturgical forms and the Fathers of the Early Church of the first six centuries, and that in this service of the Ordinarium and Canon of the Mass we are removed poles asunder from the simplicity (grand in its very rugged bareness) of the Upper Room "on the night in which He was betrayed." Holy Scripture is left far behind in the accumulation of ceremonial and the accretions and additions of doctrine. To pass from Scripture to this service is like passing into another world.

At the same time, as we carefully peruse this service, we become conscious that from it alone we could never gather the *full* Roman doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

In the service as a whole there is indeed much that harmonizes clearly with that doctrine and almost may be said to imply it.

We have the whole service couched in the most highly sacrificial language, such expressions as "immaculate host" being frequent. Sacrificial terms abound and the whole service is replete with the idea of a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.

Adoration of the consecrated elements is distinctly advocated and practised.

Such an expression as "takes the whole blood (*totum sanguinem*) along with the particle," said of the communion of the priest is indicative of Transubstantiation, at least when viewed in connection with the rest of the service.

At the same time there is at least one phrase that is distinctly reminiscent of a time when that doctrine

which is now “*de fide*” in the Roman Church, *i.e.*, Transubstantiation, was not held. I mean the phrase in the Canon of the Mass :

“That it may *become to us* the body and blood of Thy most beloved Son. . . .”

The words of the cup : “*Drink ye all of it,*” are reminiscent too of a time when communion was in both kinds.

Reminiscent too of an earlier belief are the words :

“As often as ye shall do these things ye shall do them in remembrance of Me.”

Words which Dr. Wright points out show “that at the time the Canon was drawn up, there was no such opinion held by the Church as that ‘this do in remembrance of Me,’ signified ‘this sacrifice, in remembrance of Me.’” (p. 59 “Service of the Mass in the Greek and Roman Churches.”)

The phrases “in memory of the Passion,” and “we calling to mind the blessed passion of the same Christ Thy Son our Lord,” tell also of a time when *ἀνάμνησις* “remembrance” was considered to signify *not* “a memorial before God,” but “a memento to man.” Yet, though this is so, such expressions are but the relics of an earlier time. With that earlier age, as we have said above, the Roman Service has little in common, while scriptural doctrine is buried—not to say obliterated.

CHAPTER III—(*continued*)

We pass now from the Roman service to the great authoritative dogmatic formula of the Roman Church —*the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*.

The portions that concern our present subject are found in the Decrees and Canons of
The 13th Session (1551 A.D.) “Concerning the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist ; ”
The 21st Session (1562 A.D.) “Concerning Communion in one kind ; ”
The 22nd Session (1562 A.D.) “Concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass.”

The original Latin of the doctrinal Decrees and Canons of the Council reprinted from the first edition of them, published by authority at Rome in 1564, the year following the close of the Council, may be found in Appendix No. vi. of Cramp’s “Text Book of Popery.” (2nd edit. 1841, pp. 416ff). The same book also contains a translation, from which, after comparing it with the original Latin, the quotations that follow are made.

We shall have to quote fairly fully.

1. THE 13TH SESSION (1551 A.D.)

The Decree commences with a preface which sets forth that the Council was “convened under the special guidance and government of the Holy Spirit, in order to expound the true and ancient doctrine of faith and the Sacraments, and apply a remedy to all heresies and other most grievous evils, by which the Church of God is now miserably vexed and rent into many different parts,” and then proceeds :

"Therefore the same most holy Council, delivering the genuine and wholesome doctrine of the venerable and divine sacrament of the Eucharist, as the Catholic Church, instructed by our Lord Jesus Christ and His apostles, and taught by the Holy Spirit, Who constantly leadeth her into truth, hath held and will keep to the end of the world, strictly enjoining all the faithful in Christ, that they presume not hereafter to believe, teach, or preach otherwise respecting the most holy Eucharist than is explained and defined in this present decree."

Chapter 1 of the Decree then follows thus :

"Of the Real Presence of our Lord Jesus Christ in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist."

"In the first place the holy council teacheth ; and openly and plainly professeth, that our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially (vere, realiter, ac substantialiter) contained in the pure sacrament of the holy eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, and under the species of those sensible objects. Neither is it to be regarded as contradictory that our Saviour should always sit at the right hand of the Father in heaven, according to His natural mode of existence, and yet be sacramentally present with us in His substance, in many other places, according to that mode of existence, which, though we cannot express it in words, we can nevertheless, when thought is illumined by faith, conceive to be possible with God, and ought most firmly to believe. For all our ancestors who belonged to the true Church of Christ did most plainly acknowledge, in discoursing on this most holy sacrament, that our Redeemer instituted this wondrous sacrament in the Last Supper, when, after the benediction of the bread and wine, He testified in clear and express words that He presented to His disciples His own body

and His own blood. Which words, recorded by the Evangelists, and repeated afterwards by blessed Paul, do evidently require that appropriate and clear interpretation according to which they have been understood by the Fathers : it is therefore a most heinous crime that they should be turned by certain contentious and wicked men into pretended and imaginary figures, to the denial of the truth of the flesh and blood of Christ ; contradicting therein the universal sense of the Church, the pillar and ground of the truth, which detests these vain comments, devised by impious men under the influence of Satan, and thankfully acknowledges and holds in perpetual remembrance this most excellent gift of Christ.”

Chapter II is “*of the reason of the institution of this most holy sacrament.*”

In this chapter we are told that our Lord instituted this sacrament “to establish a memorial (memoriam) of His wonderful deeds,” and that He commanded us, in partaking thereof, “to cherish His memory, and declare His death, till He shall come to judge the world ;” that he intended this sacrament “to be received as the spiritual food of souls, by which those who live by His life should be sustained and strengthened ;” that He meant it to be “an antidote to deliver us from daily faults, and preserve us from mortal sins ;” that He further designed it as “a pledge of our future glory and everlasting bliss,” and “as a symbol of that one body of which He is the head, and to which it is His will that we, the members, should be joined by the closest bonds of faith, hope, and charity, that we might all speak the same thing and no schisms be among us.”

Chapter III. is entitled “*of the excellence of the most holy Eucharist above the other sacraments.*”

It runs as follows :

"The most holy Eucharist hath this in common with the other sacraments, that it is a symbol of sacred things, a visible form of invisible grace. But herein is discovered its peculiar excellence, that while the other sacraments then first possess the power of sanctifying when they are used by anyone, the very author of sanctity is in the Eucharist before it is used, for the Apostles had not yet received the Eucharist from the hand of the Lord, when He affirmed that what He was presenting to them was really His body. And this faith has always remained in the Church of God, that immediately after the consecration, the true body of our Lord, and His true blood, together with His soul and divinity, do exist under the species of the bread and wine; His body under the species of bread, and His blood under the species of wine, by virtue of the words of consecration; His body also under the species of wine, and His blood under the species of bread and His soul under each species, through that natural connexion and concomitance by which all the parts of Christ our Lord, Who has risen from the dead, no more to die, are closely connected together; and His divinity, through the wonderful and hypostatical union thereof with His body and soul. Wherefore it is most certain that all is contained under either species, and under both; for Christ, whole and entire, exists under the species of bread and in every particle thereof, and under the species of wine, and in all its parts."

Chapter IV. is entitled : "*of Transubstantiation,*" and is as follows :

"Since therefore Christ our Redeemer affirmed that it was truly His body which was presented under the species of bread, the Church of God hath always held, and this holy council doth now renew the declaration, that by the consecration of the bread and wine,

the whole substance of the bread is converted into the substance of the Body of Christ our Lord, and the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood, which conversion is by the Holy Catholic Church, fitly and properly called transubstantiation."

Chapter V. follows as a necessary, or at least associated, consequent. It is entitled : "*Of the Worship and Veneration to be rendered to this most holy Sacrament,*"

and contains the following passage :

" There is therefore, no room to doubt that all the faithful in Christ are bound to venerate this most holy sacrament, and to render thereto the worship of 'latria,' which is due to the true God (latriae cultum qui vero Deo debetur,) according to the custom always observed in the Catholic Church."

Chapter VI. enjoins Reservation for the Sick.

Chapter VII. is "*Of the preparation to be used, in order to receive the holy eucharist worthily* (digne), and includes the following :

" The custom of the Church declares this preparation to be necessary ; that no one who is conscious of mortal sin, however contrite he may think himself to be, should venture to receive the holy Eucharist, without previous sacramental confession."

Chapter VIII. is "*Of the use of this admirable sacrament,*"

and sets forth that there are three ways of receiving this sacrament :

1. " Only sacramentally."

So received by "sinners."

2. " Only spiritually."

So received by "those who, eating with desire the heavenly bread presented to them, enjoy its fruit and use, through lively faith, working by charity."

3. " Both sacramentally and spiritually."

So received by "those who so examine and prepare themselves beforehand that they come to this divine table adorned with the nuptial garment."

The appended Canons which concern our immediate purpose are :

Canon 1. "Whoever shall deny, that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist there are truly, really and substantially contained the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with His soul and divinity, and consequently Christ entire ; but shall affirm that He is present therein only in a sign or figure, or by His power : let him be accursed (anathema)."

Canon 2. "Whoever shall affirm that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there remains the substance of the bread and wine, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ ; and shall deny that wonderful and peculiar conversion of the whole substance of the bread into His body , and of the whole substance of the wine into His blood, the species only of bread and wine remaining, which conversion the Catholic Church most fitly terms transubstantiation : let him be accursed."

Canon 3. "Whoever shall deny that Christ entire is contained in the venerable sacrament of the Eucharist under each species, and under every part of each species, when they are separated, let him be accursed."

Canon 4. "Whoever shall affirm that the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are not present in the admirable Eucharist as soon as the consecration is performed, but only as it is used and received and neither before nor after ; and that the true body of our Lord does not remain in the hosts or consecrated morsels, which are reserved or left after communion : let him be accursed."

Canon 5. "Whoever shall affirm that remission of sins is the chief fruit of the most holy Eucharist, or

that other effects are not produced thereby, let him be accursed."

Canon 6. "Whoever shall affirm, that Christ, the only begotten Son of God, is not to be adored in the holy Eucharist with the external signs of that worship which is due to God; and therefore that the Eucharist is not to be honoured with extraordinary festive celebration, nor solemnly carried about in processions; according to the laudable and universal rites and customs of holy church, nor publicly presented to the people for their adoration (*ut adoretur*) and that those who worship the same (*eius adoratores*) are idolaters: let him be accursed.

Canon 7 anathematizes those who forbid reservation "in the sacristy," and denounce the carrying of it in procession to the sick: and those who hold that "immediately after consecration it must of necessity be distributed to those who are present."

Canon 8 runs as follows:

"Whoever shall affirm that Christ, as exhibited in the Eucharist, is eaten in a spiritual manner only, and not also sacramentally and really: let him be accursed."

Canon 11 says: "Whoever shall affirm that faith only is a sufficient preparation for the reception of the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist: let him be accursed. And lest so great a sacrament should be taken unworthily, and therefore to death and condemnation, the said holy council doth decree and declare that previous sacramental confession is absolutely necessary, if a confessor is at hand, for those who are conscious of the guilt of mortal sin, however contrite they may think themselves to be. Whoever shall presume to teach, preach, or obstinately assert the contrary, or to maintain opposite opinions in public disputation: let him be ipso facto excommunicated."

We pass now to the 21st Session (1562 A.D.) dealing with "Communion in one kind."

This need not detain us long. In Chapter I. we are told that "the laity and non-officiating clergy are not bound by any divine precept to receive the sacrament of the Eucharist in both kinds," and in Chapter II. communion in one kind we are told has been "commanded to be observed as a law" by "holy mother church."

Chapter III. tells us that "the true sacrament and Christ whole and entire is received in either kind by itself."

Canon I. runs thus :

"Whoever shall affirm that all and everyone of Christ's faithful are bound by Divine command to receive the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist in both kinds, as necessary to salvation : let him be accursed."

Canon 2. "Whoever shall affirm that the holy Catholic Church had not just grounds and reasons for restricting the laity and non-officiating clergy to communion in the species of bread only, or that she hath erred therein : let him be accursed."

Canon 3. "Whoever shall deny that Christ, whole and entire, the Fountain and Author of every grace, is received under the one species of bread ; because, as some falsely affirm, He is not then received, according to His own institution, in both kinds : let him be accursed."

We pass on to Session 22nd (1562) which deals with the *Sacrifice of the Mass*.

Chapter I. "*Of the institution of the most holy sacrifice of the Mass,*" tells us :

"He therefore, our Lord and God, when about to offer Himself once for all to God the Father by His death, on the altar of the cross, that there He might

accomplish eternal redemption—knowing that His priesthood was not to be abolished by death—in the last supper, on the right in which He was betrayed, declared Himself to be constituted a priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedeck, offered His body and blood to God the Father under the species of bread and wine, and by these symbols delivered the same to be received by His apostles, whom He then appointed priests (*sacerdotes*) of the new testament, and commanded them and their successors in the priesthood (*in sacerdotio*) to offer the same (*ut offerent*) saying : ‘Do this for a commemoration of Me.’ (Luke xxii. 19). Thus hath the Catholic Church always understood and taught this doctrine ; and this the Saviour did, that He might leave to His beloved spouse, the Church, a visible sacrifice, such as human nature required, by which the bloody sacrifice made on the cross might be represented, the memory thereof preserved to the end of the world, and its salutary virtue applied for the remission of those sins which are daily committed by us.”

Chapter II. is entitled : “*That the Sacrifice of the Mass is propitiatory both for the living and the dead,*” and runs thus :

“ And since the same Christ Who once offered Himself by His blood on the altar of the cross is contained in this Divine sacrifice which is celebrated in the Mass, and offered without blood, the holy council teaches that this sacrifice is really propitiatory, and made by Christ Himself ; God is appeased by this oblation . . . for the sacrifice which is now offered by the ministry of the priests is one and the same as that which Christ then offered on the cross, only the mode of offering is different. And the fruits of that bloody oblation are plentifully enjoyed by means of this unbloody one ; so untrue is it that the

latter derogates from the glory of the former. Wherefore it is properly offered, according to apostolic tradition, not only for the sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities of living believers ; but also for the dead in Christ who are not yet thoroughly purified."

Chapter V. "*Of the solemn ceremonies of the Sacrifice of the Mass,*" says :

"Ceremonies are also used, such as mystical benedictions, lights, incense, vestments, and others of the same kind, gathered from apostolic discipline and tradition, whereby the majesty of this great sacrifice is set forth, and by these visible signs of religion and piety, the minds of the faithful are excited to the contemplation of the deep truths which are therein contained."

This statement in reference to the reason for the use of vestments, etc., and their effect on the minds of the faithful, "exciting them to the contemplation of the deep truths contained in the sacrifice of the Mass," are significant and worthy of more than passing notice in view of modern controversies on this subject.

Canon 1. is as follows :

"Whoever shall affirm that a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God in the Mass ; or that the offering is nothing else than giving Christ to us to eat : let him be accursed."

Canon 2. runs thus :

"Whoever shall affirm that by these words, 'Do this for a commemoration of Me,' Christ did not appoint His apostles priests or did not ordain that they and other priests should offer His body and blood : let him be accursed."

Canon 3. is as follows :

"Whoever shall affirm, that the sacrifice of the Mass is only a service of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare

commemoration of the sacrifice made upon the cross, and not a propitiatory offering ; or that it only benefits him who receives it, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions and other necessities : let him be accursed."

Canon 4. is as follows :

"Whoever shall affirm that the most holy sacrifice of Christ, made on the cross, is blasphemed by the sacrifice of the Mass ; or that the latter derogates from the glory of the former : let him be accursed."

The next formula to be considered is "The creed of Pope Pius IV.," issued by him in 1564. It contains an accurate and explicit summary of the Roman faith. It is "the authoritative creed of the Roman Church." All converts from Protestantism on their admission into the Roman Church have to "publicly repeat and testify their assent to it, without restriction or qualification."

The part of this creed which bears on our present subject is as follows :

"I profess likewise that in the Mass is offered to God a true, proper and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead ; and that in the most holy sacrifice of the Eucharist there is truly, really and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation."

"I confess also that under either kind alone, whole and entire, Christ and a true sacrament is received."

The only other formula that remains now for our consideration in connection with the teaching of the Church of Rome in the Lord's Supper, is "The

Catechism of the Council of Trent," published in 1566 by command of Pope Pius V.

As the Catechism for the most part, when dealing with this subject which we are considering, merely reiterates in other words the same doctrinal teaching given us in the formulae we have already quoted at length, we shall not need to traverse the whole ground again, but shall content ourselves with quoting a few passages that further explain or elucidate the doctrine of the other formulae considered above.

1. In reference to Transubstantiation the Catechism says :

"The Catholic Church, then, firmly believes, and openly professes, that in this sacrament the words of consecration accomplish three things ; first, that the true and real body of Christ, the same that was born of the Virgin, and is now seated at the right hand of the Father in heaven, is rendered present in the holy Eucharist; secondly, that however repugnant it may appear to the dictate of the senses, no substance of the elements remains in the sacraments ; and thirdly, a natural consequence of the two preceding, and one which the words of consecration also express, that the accidents which present themselves to the eyes, or other senses, exist in a wonderful and ineffable manner, without a subject. The accidents of bread and wine we see, but they inhere in no substance, and exist independently of any. The substance of the bread and wine is so changed into the body and blood of our Lord that they altogether cease to be the substance of bread and wine." (p. 221, edit. 1829). "The accidents cannot inhere in the body and blood of Christ; they must, therefore, contrary to the physical laws, subsist of themselves, inhering in no subject." (p. 232 ibid.) Transubstantiation "mocks the powers of conception, nor can we find any example of it in natural

transmutations, nor even in the wide range of creation.” (p. 231 *ibid*).

2. In the Catechism we also read in reference to the reason of the Institution of the Eucharist :

“ The Eucharist was instituted by our Lord for two great purposes, to be the celestial food of the soul, preserving and supporting spiritual life, and to give to the Church a perpetual sacrifice, by which sin may be expiated, and our heavenly Father, Whom our crimes have often grievously offended, may be turned from wrath to mercy, from the severity of just vengeance to the exercise of benignant clemency.” (p. 247 *ibid*).

3. A further passage from the Catechism is as follows :

“ For since from the common nature of men, it is specially abhorrent to be fed with the food of human flesh, or with a draught of blood, He most wisely caused that the most holy body and blood should be administered to us under the appearance of those things, namely of bread and wine, by the daily and common sustenance of which we are specially gratified. And moreover there are combined these two advantages : first, we are saved from the calumnies of the infidels, which we could not easily avoid, if we were seen to eat our Lord under His proper appearance ; the other is that while we so partake of the body and blood of our Lord in such a manner, however, that, though truly, it cannot be perceived by the senses, this is of the greatest efficacy in increasing faith in our souls.” (Part ii. cap. iv. sect. 46.)

4. We shall only quote one passage more from the Catechism. After telling us that the Eucharist, when administered to a dying person, is called the “ Viaticum,” the Catechism proceeds :

“ Because it prepares for us a passage to eternal

happiness and everlasting glory. Hence in accordance with the antient practice of the Church, none of the faithful are suffered to depart this life without being previously fortified with this living bread from heaven." (p. 208 *ibid*).

We have now considered the statements of the authoritative dogmatic formulae of the Roman Church, and are in a position to summarize and tabulate from them the Teaching of the Church of Rome on the Lord's Supper.

This therefore we shall proceed to do.

SUMMARY OF THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ROME ON THE LORD'S SUPPER.

1. Rome believes in "*The Real Presence* of our Lord Jesus Christ in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist."

Which "Real Presence" she defines as follows :

"Our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really and substantially (vere, realiter ac substantialiter) contained in the pure sacrament of the holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, and under the species (sub specie) of those sensible objects."

2. This "Real Presence" she further defines under the name of Transubstantiation.

Under this name she teaches that : "by the consecration of the bread and wine, the whole substance of the bread is converted into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood." Not a particle of bread or wine remain ; the accidents (colour, shape, appearance, taste,) of bread and wine are still there,

"but they inhere in no substance, and exist independently of any ;" the substance of bread and wine has disappeared completely, or more accurately perhaps has been changed into "Christ whole and entire, body, blood, soul and Divinity." "Under the species of bread and in every particle thereof, and under the species of wine and in all its parts," there now exists this : "Christ, whole and entire, body, blood, soul and Divinity."

3. To meet difficulties that might be placed in the way of the reception of such a dogma, Rome postulates for our Lord two modes of existence (a) a natural mode of existence, according to which He always sits at the Father's right hand ; (b) another mode of existence "which cannot be expressed in words," but which we "ought firmly to believe," according to which He is "sacramentally present with us in His substance."

4. This "Real Presence" which we have defined above in Rome's words is entirely independent of the use of the Sacrament. Other sacraments, the Church of Rome tells us, (she, of course, enumerates seven sacraments) possess the power of sanctification "only when used," but in the case of the Mass or Eucharist, "the very author of sanctity," she teaches us, that, Christ Himself, as we have said above, body, blood, soul and Divinity, is "in the Eucharist *before it is used.*" Immediately after consecration, "the true body of our Lord and the true blood, together with soul and Divinity, exist under the species of bread and wine." In "the Divine sacrifice of the Mass," as the Roman Church calls it, she teaches that there is "contained the same Christ, the same true and real body of Christ, that was born of the blessed Virgin, that hung upon the cross and that now sits at the right hand of the Father in heaven."

5. From all this there follows consistently, that

Christ so present in the bread and wine (which, as we have seen, are believed to have been transubstantiated into His body and blood) ought to be adored with "the worship of latria, which is due to the true God."

6. This same Christ Who offered Himself upon the cross, "contained," as the Church of Rome teaches, "in this Divine sacrifice of the Mass," is "offered without blood" to the Father Who "is appeased by this oblation." It is the same sacrifice, "one and the same" as "that which Christ offered upon the cross, only the mode of offering is different." It is thus a real "propitiatory sacrifice" "for the sins, punishments, satisfaction, and other necessities of living believers, and also for the dead in Christ who are not yet thoroughly purified."

7. This "most holy sacrifice of the Mass," the Church of Rome teaches, was instituted by our Lord in the Upper Room at Jerusalem when He "offered His body and blood to the Father under the species of bread and wine." At this same moment, the Roman Church also teaches, our Lord commanded His apostles, "whom He then appointed sacrificing priests" (sacerdotes) "of the new testament" and "their successors in the priesthood" (sacerdotio) to offer the same sacrifice continually.

8. The reason of the institution was, so Rome teaches, that our Lord wished to give to His Church "a perpetual sacrifice, by which sin may be expiated and our heavenly Father . . . turned from wrath to mercy;" "a visible sacrifice," by which the sacrifice of the cross might be represented, and its memory preserved, and its salutary virtue applied. And also that it might be to His Church "the celestial food of the soul, preserving and supporting spiritual life."

In the Decrees of the Council of Trent concerning

Transubstantiation, other reasons for the Institution are given (chap. ii. of Session 13,) but these are evidently minor reasons. The Catechism of the Council of Trent calls the two reasons given above "the two great purposes" for which the Eucharist was instituted by our Lord, and in the decree concerning the Institution of the Mass (chap. 1. session 23,) the first of these is the reason given for the Institution, while the second is mentioned in connection with it and as subsidiary to it.

The minor reasons enumerated in the Decree concerning the Eucharist referred to above (chap. ii. of Session 13) are as follows :

1. To be "a memorial of His wonderful deeds."
2. "To cherish His memory."
3. "To declare His death."
4. To be "the spiritual food of souls, to sustain and strengthen those who live by His life."
5. An "antidote to deliver us from daily faults, and preserve us from mortal sin."
6. "A pledge of future glory and everlasting bliss."
7. "A symbol of the body of which we are members," and of love and union amongst ourselves as members of that body.
9. While wishing "that at every Mass the faithful who are present would communicate," the Church of Rome not only does not condemn, but "approves and commends" masses "in which the priest only sacramentally communicates."
10. As a preparation for the actual communicating, "faith only" is not sufficient preparation. "For those who are conscious of the guilt of mortal sin," (which in practice means everybody) the preparation by "previous sacramental confession is absolutely necessary."
11. In the Decrees concerning the Eucharist

(Session 13), in chapter viii., we have statements made which, until carefully weighed, might appear capable of a not definitely Roman meaning. We are told that there are three ways of receiving this holy sacrament.

1. "Only sacramentally," which is done by sinners.
2. "Only spiritually," which is done by "those who, eating with desire the heavenly bread presented to them, enjoy its fruit and use through lively faith, working by charity."
3. "Both sacramentally and spiritually," which is done by those "who examine and prepare themselves beforehand that they come to this Divine table adorned with the nuptial garment."

The key to the interpretation of the passage is that receiving "sacramentally" does not mean receiving the outward sign without the thing signified, which, in the mouth of a Protestant it would; but to receive "sacramentally" means in the language of the Roman Church "to eat Christ in the visible sacrament." So Bishop Gardiner explained it in his confutation of Archbishop Cranmer's fourth book "on the Lord's Supper." (See Park. Soc. Cranmer "on the Lord's Supper," p. 201.) With this key the meaning becomes clear. Sinners only eat "sacramentally," i.e., they only eat Christ in the visible sacrament, without enjoying "the fruit and use" of the sacrament.

Some eat "only spiritually," i.e., good men who feed in faith without the visible sacrament.

A third class eat "both sacramentally and spiritually," i.e., examining and preparing themselves beforehand they come "in the nuptial garment" and eat Christ "sacramentally," i.e., in the visible sacrament, but also "spiritually," i.e., they enjoy "the fruit and use" of the sacrament also.

The Protestant view of the threefold eating is totally different, as we shall see later.

12. The Church of Rome further holds that "the laity and non-officiating clergy are not bound by any Divine precept to receive the sacrament of the Eucharist in both kinds;" indeed it is "the law" of the Church that they should receive it only in one kind. In this connection Rome teaches that "the true sacrament, and Christ whole and entire, is received in either kind by itself."

13. The Church of Rome further teaches that in the Eucharist there is an oral manducation by all who partake, whatever their moral or spiritual qualifications may be, of the real body and blood of Christ, which, as we have seen, she believes to be "truly, really, and substantially" present under the species of bread and under the species of wine. (Communicants, apart from the officiating priest, only receive as noted above, "under the species of bread.")

14. The last point in the teaching of the Roman Church we need notice is that she teaches that all the faithful should be "fortified" with this sacrament before they die, for it is a "Viaticum"—"it prepares a passage for us to eternal happiness and everlasting glory."

It is worthy of note that the Roman Church claims that all this teaching is "the faith held always in the Church of God"—and claims this not only once, but repeatedly.

Of this claim we can only say, in the words of Archbishop Cranmer in another connection, that it is "**A PLAIN UNTRUTH.**"

We have summarized now very fully what we might call the *Positive Teaching* of the Church of Rome on the Lord's Supper. But Rome is *Negative* as well as positive.

Let us then briefly tabulate her negative propositions, as these must be taken together with the others, to see her doctrine in its true perspective.

1. She anathematizes those who teach that Christ is present in the sacrament, *i.e.*, in the bread and wine, "only in a sign or figure, or by His power."

2. And as might be supposed from the preceding, she rejects the interpretation of the words: "This is My body, etc.,," which makes the "is" equivalent to "represents," saying that it was "devised by impious men under the influence of Satan."

3. She rejects Consubstantiation, anathematizing those who affirm that "the substance of the bread and wine remain in the sacrament together with the body and blood of our Lord."

4. A presence only in use and reception she will have none of.

5. A spiritual feeding on Christ "as exhibited in the Eucharist," which is not also sacramental and real, is condemned absolutely.

6. That "faith only" is a sufficient preparation for reception is explicitly denied.

7. Those who hold that communion in *both* kinds is "a Divine command," are anathematized.

8. The idea that the Eucharist is nothing more than a feeding on Christ is condemned.

9. The Sacrifice of the Mass, she teaches, is more than "a service of praise and thanksgiving."

10. In the Eucharist there is more than "a bare commemoration of the sacrifice made on the cross."

11. The idea that the Eucharist "only benefits him who receives it" is denounced.

12. The sacrifice on the cross is not "blasphemed by the sacrifice of the Mass," nor does the latter, so the Church of Rome teaches, derogate from the glory of the former.

It will be seen from the above that the Protestant position is entirely repudiated. "The line of deep cleavage" between the Teaching of the Church of Rome on the Lord's Supper and the Teaching of Protestantism, whether as represented by the teaching of the Church of England, or by other Protestant Churches such as the Lutheran, is marked and complete.

We have now stated the Teaching of Scripture, of the Primitive Church, and of the Church of Rome.

It remains now for us to state the Doctrine of the Church of England and then to institute a comparison between it and the former.

CHAPTER IV

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND TEACHING ON THE LORD'S SUPPER.

For the Doctrine of the Church of England on this subject our sources of information—the *only authoritative* sources of information—are “The Book of Common Prayer” together with “The Thirty-Nine Articles.”

These must be interpreted, it is well to note, in the light of their history and compilation.

The views of the compilers and revisers, as given in their various works and writings, are of the greatest help and assistance in determining the meaning of any doubtful point; and it seems to me that to interpret either the Prayer Book or the Articles in a sense that is flatly contradictory to the known views and opinions of those by whom they were compiled, and opposed to the whole tenor and trend of the history of their compilation, is—to say the least—illogical.

Prayer Book and Articles alike have a history, and they must be interpreted in the light of that history.

The portions which deal with the subject before us are :

1. “The Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion.”
2. “The Catechism,” (concluding or “sacramental” portion).
3. Articles 25, 28, 29, 30 and 31.

We shall commence with a consideration of “The Order of the Administration of the Lord’s Supper or Holy Communion.”

It will not be necessary for us in this case to give so full and detailed a sketch of the service as we have done in the case of the Primitive Church and of the Church of Rome. The words of the service are so well-known to Churchmen that to quote the service in extenso does not appear needful.

We shall therefore confine ourselves to a skeleton outline or framework of the service.

The service consists of three parts :

I. *The Preparatory Part*, more usually called “The ante-communion service.”

II. *The Central Part.*

III. *The Concluding Part* or “The post-communion service.”

I. THE PREPARATORY PART.

The only piece of ceremonial preparation mentioned is the placing of “a fair white linen cloth” upon “the Table,” previous to the commencement of the service and in readiness for “the Communion-time;” and the taking up by the “priest” or “presbyter” (in the Prayer Book and Articles “priest” as applied to the Church of England clergymen is short for “presbyter”) of his position, “standing at the North side of the table.”

Later on in the preparatory portion of the service there is the preparation of the elements. Just before “The prayer for the Church Militant,” the “priest” or “presbyter” is directed “when there is a communion” to “then place upon the table so much bread and wine, as he shall think sufficient; but before any of the actual service commences the only pieces of

preparation mentioned are those two first enumerated above.

Contrasted with the service of the Church of Rome this is significant. The Church of England, as we shall see from our outline sketch of the service, lays the stress *not* on the ceremonial preparation, but on the *spiritual* preparation of the worshippers and of the communicants.

I distinguish the two thus (*i.e.*, worshippers and communicants) because the preparatory part of the service up to the end of the offertory sentences may be used when there is no Communion. In such a case, I take it, it is a *spiritual* preparation of the worshippers assembled in the Church, whether confirmed or unconfirmed, for communion at some future date. When the administration of the Holy Communion follows, this portion is of course in addition to what we might call a general preparation, a *special* preparation for those who are actually about to communicate at that particular Service.

This preparatory part or ante-communion service is as follows :

(a) *The Lord's Prayer*; in which prayer is made for forgiveness and other mercies.

(b) *The Collect for Purity*: in which we pray for God, "by the inspiration of His Holy Spirit" to "cleanse" even "the thoughts of our hearts, so that we may love Him with a perfect love and so bring the glory which we ought to bring to His holy name.

(c) *The Ten Commandments*, after each of which, the people in what is usually called from its opening word, or rather from the Greek form of its opening word "The Kyrie," "ask God mercy for their transgression thereof for the time past, and grace to keep the same for the time to come."

(d) *Two Alternate Prayers for the King*, in which

we pray that the King may so " seek God's honour and glory," that we, God's people, may be preserved " in wealth (=welfare, old Eng. " weal ") peace and godliness."

(e) Then follows *The Collect, Epistle and Gospel* for the day, designed to instruct and edify us in our most holy faith.

(f) These are followed by *The Nicene Creed*, a personal and individual confession of faith by each individual communicant made collectively by the whole body of worshippers.

(g) This is followed by *The Sermon* or homily ("one of the homilies already set forth, or hereafter to be set forth by authority"—a reference to the First and Second Book of Homilies, set forth respectively in 1547 and 1563).

(h) The sermon or homily ended, the "priest" returns to "the Lord's Table" and begins "the Offertory," which includes :

1. What we usually speak of as "the collection," during which "one or more sentences," mostly from Holy Scripture, are read.
2. The bringing of "the alms for the poor" and "other devotions (=gifts) of the people" to the "priest," in "a decent basin to be provided by the parish for that purpose." The "priest" shall then "humbly present and place it upon the holy table."
3. The placing "upon the table" by the "priest," "when there is a Communion" of "so much bread and wine, as he shall think sufficient."

(i) "After which done," there follows "The prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church Militant here in earth."

This brings the preparation part of ante-communion service to a close.

There is a natural pause here during which those not

intending to communicate at that particular communion withdraw.

It is true that in our present Prayer Book there is no explicit Rubric to this effect, but the history of the book makes it clear that the withdrawal at this point of all who do not then intend to communicate is distinctly contemplated by the Church.

In the Second Prayer Book of King Edward VI. were the following words in one of the longer exhortations :

“ Whereas ye offend God so sore in refusing this holy banquet, I admonish, exhort, and beseech you that unto this unkindness ye will not add any more. Which thing ye shall do, if ye stand by as gazers and lookers on them that do communicate, and be no partakers of the same yourselves.

“ For what thing can this be accounted else than a further contempt and unkindness to God. Truly it is a great unthankfulness to say nay when ye be called ; but the fault is much greater when men stand by, and yet will neither eat nor drink this holy Communion with other. I pray you, what can this be else, but even to have the mysteries of Christ in derision? It is said unto all : Take ye and eat. Take and drink ye all of this ; do this in remembrance of Me. With what face then, or with what countenance shall ye hear these words ? What will this be else but a neglecting, a despising, and mocking of the Testament of Christ ? Wherefore, rather than you should do so, depart you hence and give place to them that be godly disposed.”

These words were repeated in the Prayer Books of 1559 (Elizabeth) and 1604 (James I.) : and in the Homilies of 1563, *i.e.*, the Second Book of Homilies, of which our 35th Article says : that it “ doth contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine and necessary for

these times, as doth the former book of homilies," very similar words were used.

We read there :

"Everyone of us must be guests, and not gazers, eaters and not lookers, feeding ourselves and not hiring other to feed for us . . . we must be ourselves partakers of this table and not beholders of others." (Hom. xv. "Of the worthy receiving of the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.")

At the last revision in 1662 it was not found necessary to repeat the exhortation we have quoted above from the Prayer Books of 1552, 1559 and 1604, because by this time (1662) the practice of non-communicating attendance had become obsolete.

At the close of the preparatory part there are inserted in our Prayer Book two long "Exhortations" to be used, the one ordinarily, the other if the people be "negligent to come to the Holy Communion," after the sermon or homily in giving notice of the administration of the Holy Communion.

These need not detain us further, for the present, were it not that the concluding paragraph of the first of these has been, and is, held by some to teach that the Church of England believes in and sanctions what is usually known as "auricular confession,"—sometimes called "special private confession," or "the confessing of sins one by one to God before His priest"—previous to and as a preparation for the reception of the Holy Communion.

It could, I think, be shown that nowhere, not even in the "Visitation of the Sick," does the Church of England teach or sanction Confession IN THIS SENSE. But this would be beyond the scope of our present subject.

We shall, therefore, only deal with the concluding paragraph of this exhortation in the Communion

service, which is sometimes, as we have said above, used as support for the inculcation of "auricular" or "special private" confession as a preparation—if not a necessary preparation—for the reception of the Holy Communion.

Interpreted in the light of its history this paragraph will be seen to neither teach nor lend sanction to any such idea. A comparison of the wording of this paragraph in our present Prayer Book and its wording in the Order of Communion of 1548 and in the Prayer Book of 1549, will make this clear.

ORDER OF COMMUNION (1548)
AND FIRST PRAYER BOOK OF
EDWARD VI. (1549).

"And if there be any of you whose conscience is troubled and grieved in anything, lacking comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other *discreet and learned Priest*, taught in the law of God, and confess and open his *sin and grief secretly*, that he may receive such ghostly counsel, advice and comfort, that his conscience may be relieved, and *that of us (as of the Ministers of God and of the Church)* he may receive *comfort and absolution* to the satisfaction of his mind, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness: requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession, not to be offended with them that do use, to their further satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to the Priest; nor those also which think needful or convenient, for the quietness of their own consciences, particularly to open their sins to the Priest, to be offended with them that are satisfied with their humble confession to God and the general confession to the Church. But in all things to follow and keep the rule of charity, and every man to be satisfied with his own conscience, not judging other men's minds or consciences; whereas he hath no warrant of God's word to the same."

PRESENT PRAYER BOOK AS IN
PRAYER BOOKS OF 1552, AND 1559
EXCEPT FOR TRANSPOSITION OF
ONE SENTENCE; AND AS IN RE-
VISIONS OF 1604 AND 1662 (THE
LAST REVISION).

"And because it is requisite, that no man should come to the Holy Communion, but with a full trust in God's mercy, and with a quiet conscience; therefore, if there be any of you who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein (i.e., by means of self-examination spoken of previously) but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me or to some other *discreet and learned Minister of God's word*, and *open his grief*: that by the ministry of God's Holy Word he may receive the benefit of *absolution*, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness."

It will be seen at a glance that the alterations and omissions are most significant.

1. The "discreet and learned priest, taught in the law of God," has given place, evidently for fear of misconception, to the "discreet and learned minister of God's Word;" which, it might be noted, would include the "deacon" as well as the "priest" or presbyter.

2. "Confess and open his sin and grief secretly" has been altered into "open his grief."

The omission of the words "confess," "sin," and "secretly" here are all *most* significant. There is nothing in the present paragraph to imply that a man or woman cannot, if they wish, take with them some friend or relative when they go to "open their grief" to the "minister of God's Word." The word "secretly" suggested something entirely different. It suggested confession in the Roman sense of the word.

3. The words "that of us (as of the ministers of God and of the Church) he may receive comfort and absolution," have given place to the words: "that by the ministry of God's holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution."

The change from "that of us (as of the ministers of God and of the Church) he may receive" . . . to "that by the ministry of God's holy Word he may receive," is distinctly significant of a change of meaning; while the change from "he may receive . . . absolution" to "he may receive *the benefit* of absolution," is a distinct alteration of teaching. "Absolution" and "*the benefit* of absolution" are two distinct things. "Absolution" is, in this connection, the technical term for "a judicial pardon of sin by man acting in the place of God." "*The benefit* of absolution" is, on the other hand, perfect assurance, and trust in God's mercy, and "a quiet conscience."

4. The whole paragraph making “auricular” or “special private” confession optional (instead of as in the Roman Church, compulsory) is obliterated from the Prayer Book of 1552 and since, together with every phrase in this paragraph that might be supposed in any way to lend countenance to this practice.

What is contemplated in this paragraph is “consultation” rather than “confession” in its usually understood sense. This view is supported by the words of the homily “Of Repentance” in the Second Book of Homilies (which, as we have said above, our 35th Article declares to “contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times ; ”) where we read :

“ It is most evident and plain that this auricular confession hath not his warrant of God’s Word. . . . I do not say, but that, if any do find themselves troubled in conscience, they may repair to their learned curate or pastor, or to some other godly learned man, and shew the trouble and doubt of their conscience to them, that they may receive at their hand the comfortable salve of God’s Word ; but it is against the true Christian liberty, that any man should be bound to the numbering of his sins as it hath been used heretofore in the time of blindness and ignorance.” (Hom. xx. in Book II “ Of Repentance.”)

While it may be said that the Church of England, while rejecting *habitual* private confession, allows it in two exceptional cases (here, and in “visitation of the sick,”) it is, I think, more accurate to say that of “confession” in the *Roman* sense the Church of England knows nothing, but in two exceptional cases, the one where a man “cannot quiet his own conscience” with a view to the reception of the Holy Communion, the other, in the case of sickness “if the sick person feel his conscience troubled with any

“weighty matter,” she recommends in the one case “the opening of his grief” and in the other “a special confession of his sins,” with a view evidently to his conscience being no longer troubled with the “weighty matter,” whatever it be, that troubled it before.

Call it in either case “confession” or “consultation,” as you will, only in the former case we must remember that the “confession,” even in these two exceptional cases, is something very different from “confession” in the Roman sense, and implies no detailed examination of *every* sin.

It is as a remedy for special cases *only* that the Church of England recommends the use of “private confession,” and then, as the Bishop of Sodor and Man (Dr. Drury) has pointed out in his book, “Confession and Absolution,” (pp. 141 and 142.) “That a totally different thing is meant to the popish confessional is clear from the fact that the old terms: “secret and auricular” and “sacramental confession” wholly disappeared. It was to be no longer regarded as in any sense necessary. It is never recommended save as exceptional for special cases. It might be made to a layman (see “Homilies” No. 20, Book II. “Of Repentance,”) as well as to a priest, for the essential point was to obtain the counsel of someone learned in God’s word. Still the minister was the obvious person to whom men would turn. . . . No enumeration of all sins was considered necessary or desirable the purpose of such confession was not to obtain God’s pardon but only the assurance of it through the ministry of the Word.”

After this digression we now resume our outline sketch of the Communion Service.

II. THE CENTRAL PART.

This may be sub-divided into three parts :

1. Special and additional preparation of those about to communicate.
2. The Consecration.
3. The actual Administration.

1. *Special and additional preparation of those about to communicate.*

This comprises :

(a) *The Long Exhortation* ("Dearly beloved in the Lord." . . .) which sets forth very fully :

1. The state of mind which should exist in intending recipients.

2. The benefits of reception in a right state of mind and soul, and closes with a reminder of the purpose and object of the Institution by our Lord of this Sacred Feast.

(b) This is followed by *the shorter Exhortation*, which sets forth in a concise form the qualifications required in those who are invited "to take this holy sacrament to their comfort."

(c) Then follows *The General Confession* by minister and people together.

(d) Followed by *the Absolution*, said by the celebrant.

(e) Next come *the Comfortable Words*, consisting of four passages of Scripture, which remind us of God's readiness to forgive and His willingness to receive all who come to Him through Jesus Christ.

(f) These are followed by *the Sursum Corda* ("Lift up your hearts," etc.)

(g) And *the Dignum et Justum* ("It is very meet, right, etc.") with a Proper Preface (if any) followed by : "Therefore with angels and archangels, etc." (including part of the old "Sanctus.")

(h) Next follows "*The Prayer of Humble Access*," ("We do not presume. . . .") in which we renounce "all claims to receive the seal of God's pardoning mercy in the sacrament on the ground of any merits of our own."

2. *The Consecration.*

At this point the priest is directed, "standing before the Table," to "so order the bread and wine that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people, and take the cup into his hands," and when he hath so ordered the elements he is directed to say "*the Prayer of Consecration*," which commences with a reference to the Sacrifice of Christ upon the cross as "a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world," and closes with a recital of the words of Institution, accompanied by what are usually called "the Manual Acts."

3. *The Actual Administration* "in both kinds," "into their hands" with a stated formula in each case.

III. THE CONCLUDING PART OR THE POST-COMMUNION SERVICE.

The Communion ended, the Post-Communion service begins after the minister has "reverently" placed upon "the Lord's Table" "what remaineth of the consecrated Elements, covering the same with a fair linen cloth."

Priest and people repeat together :

- (a) *The Lord's Prayer.*
- (b) This is followed by one of the alternate *Prayers of Thanksgiving.*
- (c) Followed again by the repetition of "*The Gloria in Excelsis.*"
- (d) Last of all comes *The Blessing.*

Then followed certain Rubrics which provide among other things :

1. That there shall be no communion " except four (or three at the least) communicate with the priest."
2. That the bread shall be " such as is usual to be eaten."
3. That if any of the bread and wine that was " consecrated " remain, " it shall not be carried out of the Church, but the priest, and such other of the communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall, immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same."
4. That " every parishoner shall communicate at the least three times in the year, of which Easter shall be one."

Last of all there stands what is usually called "*The Black Rubric*," which runs as follows :

" Whereas it is ordained in this office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, that the communicants should receive the same kneeling ; (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the Holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue :) yet, lest the same kneeling should, by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved ; it is hereby declared, That thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians) and

the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here ; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one."

I have quoted this rubric in full, because there are several points in reference to it that require consideration and elucidation, both as its history and its contents.

The "Black" Rubric (so called because originally it was, and still usually is, printed in "black" type, the other Rubrics being in "red" type) first appeared in the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. (1552) being "joined" to it by an Order in Council at the very last moment of the publication of the Second Book, some copies, indeed, being already in print before the "Order in Council" appeared. Its insertion was due to the attack made by John Knox, who was a licensed preacher at this time, and by Bishop Hooper against the practice of "kneeling" at the reception of the sacrament, which was directed by a Rubric in the Second Prayer Book then being issued.

At the next revision in 1559 when the Book of Common Prayer (substantially the Second Book of King Edward the Sixth) was restored by Queen Elizabeth, this rubric as forming no part of the statutory Prayer Book of 1552 (being only inserted at the last moment, as we have seen, by an "Order in Council") was not re-enacted.

At the last revision in 1662 it was, however, re-inserted owing to the influence of Bishops Gauden and Morley, and of the Earl of Southampton. On this occasion, with one verbal alteration, it received the full sanction of Convocation and was enacted by Parliament as part of the Statutory Book of Common Prayer (see Proctor and Frere, "A New History of the Book of Common Prayer," pages 503 note and 204 note.)

As to the contents of the rubric. At its re-insertion in 1662 there was made, as we have already said, a verbal alteration. What that verbal alteration was we shall see if we place the two versions of the sentence in which it occurs, side by side.

1552.

"It is not meant thereby that any adoration is done, or ought to be done either unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or to ANY REAL OR ESSENTIAL PRESENCE there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood."

(Park. Soc., Lit. of Ed. VI., p. 283.)

1662 AND SINCE.

"Thereby no adoration is intended or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto ANY CORPORAL PRESENCE of Christ's natural flesh and blood."

It has been held that this verbal change (indicated in the above by the capitals) is also a doctrinal change, and that the Rubric as now worded implicitly affirms the Real Presence in the consecrated elements instead of denying it. Whether this is so we must consider.

In 1552 "Real and Essential Presence" was equivalent to "Real and Substantial Presence." The Realistic philosophy of Aquinas had, as Mr. Tomlinson has pointed out, made "essence" equivalent to "substance." (vide "The Prayer Book, Articles, and Homilies," p. 264.) In 1552, as the same writer points out, "the scholastic terms 'real and essential,' when used of a 'body' (*corpus*) would be universally understood as equivalent to 'corporal,' and were in fact expressed by that word in the Twenty-Ninth Article, published at the same time by the authors of this very declaration." (ibid pp. 264 and 265.)

The Article referred to (as far as concerns our present purpose) was as follows :

"And because (as holy scripture doth teach) Christ was taken up into heaven and there shall continue unto the end of the world ; a faithful man ought not, either

to believe, or openly to confess *the real and bodily presence* (as they term it) *i.e.*, realem et corporalem presentiam (ut loquuntur), of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper." (Park. Soc. Lit. of Ed. VI. p. 534.)

But in 1662 men were no longer familiar with the language of the schools, and therefore the denial of any "real and essential presence," might be considered a denial of any true presence whatever, even of such a presence as was held by many of the Swiss divines abroad or by the divines of the Westminster Confession of Faith at home. The phrase was accordingly altered to "**ANY CORPORAL PRESENCE,**" but no real doctrinal change was thereby made or intended.

The Bishop of Durham (Dr. Moule) has some clear remarks on this point. He says :

"In the Prayer Book of 1552 . . . the words are 'real and essential presence,' that is, 'presence of the Thing (Res, realis) of the Sacrament, in its Being; ; that is, a presence (in this case) of the actual body and blood of Calvary. Carefully weighed, these words mean the same as 'corporal presence.''" ("The Pledges of His Love," p. 143) and he also says that the phrase "corporal presence" means "bodily presence, presence of the body (whether glorified or unglorified) *as a body.*" (ibid p. 143.)

And lower down (ibid p. 145) the Bishop, commenting on the phrase : "Christ's *natural* flesh and blood," says : "'Natural' does not mean unglorified ; for 'the natural body' is said to be now 'in Heaven and not here.'"

This leads us on to point out that the Rubric as we now have it, distinctly denies the belief of *any Real Presence* of Christ (whether of His body as "unglorified," or as "glorified") IN the consecrated elements ; and also forbids most explicitly any adoration

whatsoever of the consecrated bread and wine or of any supposed presence of Christ's flesh and blood, whether materially or in what is sometimes called a "spiritual or supernatural manner," "IN, with, or under the forms or veils of bread and wine."

Having considered this Rubric at some length, this may be the most suitable place to consider one or two other phrases or points in the service, which are frequently in dispute.

1. The phrase in the first of the two alternative Post-Communion prayers :

"*this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.*"

Does this mean that the Holy Communion is a Sacrifice in the sense that we offer the consecrated elements as a Sacrifice to God ? or does it mean that the Holy Communion is a Sacrifice which *consists in* "praise and thanksgiving ?" "Sacrifice of praise" in the old Canon of the Mass, is undoubtedly, as the context shows, used in the first of these senses. But that the words as used in our present Prayer Book clearly have the second of these meanings is manifest from a passage in the writings of Archbishop Cranmer, the chief compiler of the Prayer Book of 1552, which is substantially, with a few minor alterations, our Prayer Book to-day.

Cranmer writes thus :

"That all men may the better understand this sacrifice of Christ, which He made for the great benefit of all men, it is necessary to know the distinction and diversity of sacrifices. One kind of sacrifice there is, which is called a propitiatory or merciful sacrifice, that is to say, such sacrifice as pacifieth God's wrath and indignation, and obtaineth mercy and forgiveness for all our sins, and is the ransom for our redemption from everlasting damnation.

"And although in the old testament there were certain

sacrifices called by that name, yet in very deed there is but one such sacrifice, whereby our sins be pardoned, and God's mercy and favour obtained, which is the death of the Son of God our Lord Jesus Christ ; nor never was any other sacrifice propitiatory at any time, nor never shall be.

"This is the honour and glory of this our high Priest, wherein He admitteth neither partner nor successor. For by His own oblation He satisfied His Father for all men's sins, and reconciled mankind unto His grace and favour. And whosoever deprive Him of His honour, and go about to take it to themselves, they be very antichrists, and most arrogant blasphemers against God and against His Son Jesus Christ, Whom He hath sent.

"Another kind of sacrifice there is which doth not reconcile us to God, but is made of them that be reconciled by Christ, to testify our duties unto God and to show ourselves thankful unto Him. And therefore they be called sacrifices of laud, praise, and thanksgiving.

"The first kind of sacrifice Christ offered to God for us ; the second kind we ourselves offer to God by Christ.

"And by the first kind of sacrifice Christ offered also us unto His Father ; and by the second we offer ourselves and all that we have unto Him and His Father." ("On the Lord's Supper," Book V., chap. 3, pp. 234-236, edit. Thynne).

This passage, using as it does almost the identical words of our Post Communion Prayer of thanksgiving, where the mention of "this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" is followed by the words : "here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, or souls and bodies to be a reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice unto Thee," is quite clear as to the meaning

of the words as they are used in the Prayer Book Post-Communion Service.

2. The other point for consideration is the concluding paragraph of "The prayer for the Church Militant."

It has been held that this paragraph, added at the last revision in 1662, contains a "prayer for the faithful departed."

How this can be fairly extracted from that paragraph passes my comprehension.

The distinct change of tone which takes place with the commencement of this paragraph precludes such an idea. We have just prayed for the sick, etc. "And we most humbly beseech Thee of Thy goodness, O Lord, etc., " then the prayer passes into a most marked way into thanksgiving : " And we also BLESS Thy holy Name for all Thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and fear ; " passing again into petition, not for the departed but for " *us* ; " " beseeching Thee to give *us* grace, so to follow their good examples, that *with them we* (*not* 'that they with us') may be partakers of Thy heavenly kingdom : grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate. Amen."

There is no sign here of prayers for the departed : there is only *thanksgiving* for the faithful departed followed by prayer for ourselves that we may so follow their good examples that with them we may partake of the Master's heavenly kingdom.

Lastly, on this point, any petition for the faithful departed is distinctly excluded by the title of the whole prayer. The prayer is a prayer for "the whole state of Christ's Church MILITANT HERE IN EARTH." The fact that at the last revision when the clause under consideration was added, the title as it is now, (and as it was constituted in the Prayer Book

of 1552, when all prayer for the departed was completely expunged from the Book of Common Prayer) was retained, after discussion, shows clearly that by the insertion of the last paragraph the revisers had no intention of restoring prayer for the departed in connection with the celebration of the Lord's Supper, but only of adding a thankful commemoration of all those "departed this life in God's faith and fear."

A few minor but significant points may well be noted here.

(a) In the second Post-Communion Prayer we have the words : "we most heartily thank Thee, for that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ." The change in phraseology from the First Prayer Book (1549) is noteworthy. In that book the clause runs thus : "We most heartily thank Thee, for that Thou hast vouchsafed to feed us in these holy mysteries with the spiritual food of the most precious body of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ."

The change may seem a slight one, but the words of 1549 might have seemed to imply that *all* the communicants received the body and blood of Christ; whereas by the words as they now stand (since 1552) the partaking of the body and blood of Christ is limited to those who "have *duly* received."

(b) What is the meaning of the phrase : "*holy mysteries*," which occurs several times in the Communion Service.

It may mean one of two things.

1. = "Holy sacramental symbols," i.e., referring to the bread and wine as symbolizing the body and blood of Christ.

2. = "Rites reserved for full Christians, as

distinguished from mere enquirers, or from those so young as to be incapable of apprehension of their significance," (Moule, interpreting on the analogy of the Greek *μυστήριον* = a secret and significant rite of religion (see "Pledges of His Love," p. 139.)

The first interpretation appears the best.

(c) The words in the prayer of consecration : "Grant that we receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood," call for notice.

Commenting on these words the late Dean Goode says :

"Here is a solemn prayer to God, that when we partake of the consecrated elements, we '*may be* partakers of Christ's most blessed body and blood ;' necessarily implying that we may partake of the elements *without* being made partakers of Christ's body and blood. In fact, if all who partake of the elements do . . . necessarily partake of Christ's body and blood, this prayer becomes a mere mockery. For it is not a prayer for their *worthy* reception of Christ's body and blood, or their reception of them so as to be *benefited* by them, but merely a prayer that they *may receive* them." ("On the Eucharist," vol. ii. p. 615.)

(d) We shall only consider one more point under this head, *i.e.*, the words in the prayer of humble access : "Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us."

There has been a significant alteration in these words

in 1552 and after. In 1549 they ran thus : " Grant us therefore (gracious Lord) so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ and to drink His blood *in these holy mysteries.*" Words which could be taken to imply a presence of the flesh and blood of Christ *in* the consecrated elements. As we have the words now they cannot be used to support any such idea.

On the closing portion of the words ("that our sinful bodies, etc.,") the Bishop of Durham comments thus :

"A rhythmic sentence, not meant necessarily to imply (what Scripture gives no hint of) that the bread of the holy Supper acts specially on our body, and the wine on our soul, but to emphasize with an almost poetic eloquence the thoroughness of the work of the great sacrifice for our whole being, ("Pledges of His Love," p. 140), and further explains thus : "that our whole being, body and soul, may be accepted before the Holy One by the merit and virtue of the sacrifice of Christ's death, of which the bread and wine are the Sacrament." (p. 141 *ibid.*)

Before we proceed to give a *full* account of the Doctrine of the Church of England on the Lord's Supper, it seems advisable, because to do so will be a help to the determining of what that doctrine really is, to give a sketch of the stages by which the present doctrinal statements of the Church of England on this subject have been arrived at.

CHAPTER V

A SKETCH OF THE STAGES BY WHICH THE PRESENT DOCTRINAL STATEMENTS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ON THE LORD'S SUPPER HAVE BEEN ARRIVED AT.

Previous to 1548 the service of Holy Communion as used in the Church of England (whether according to the use of Sarum, Bangor, York or Hereford) was in all essentials practically identical with that used now in the Church of Rome.

This had not, of course, *always* been so in England, but it had come to be so and for some centuries previous to 1548 it had been so.

1. In 1548 the first step in the work of reformation of the service was taken by the publication of "*The Order of the Communion*," which was practically a piece in English (concerned with the actual communion of the people, as its name implies) sandwiched into the old Service of the Mass, which, in all other respects, remained as hitherto. Yet even in this new "Order," leaving as it did the old Service of the Mass practically untouched, there were significant changes.

1. English was used for the first time. Hitherto all the service had been in Latin ; now at least a portion, albeit a small one, was in English.
2. Communion was to be administered in *both* kinds.
3. Confession before Communion, *i.e.*, "*Auricular Confession*," was no longer compulsory, but optional.
4. There was to be no elevation at the consecration ("without any elevation or lifting up.")

But the actual doctrine as to the Lord's Supper was left unaltered. There was a rubric which said :

" Men must not think less to be received in part, than in the whole, but in each of them (*i.e.*, " broken pieces," into which " the consecrated breads " were to be divided) the whole body of our Saviour Jesu Christ." (See Park. Soc. Lit. of Ed. VI. pp. 1—8).

2. The second stage was "*The Book of Common Prayer of 1549.*"

The following points deserve notice :

1. The word " Mass " was retained in the title (" commonly called the Mass ") though the names now made prominent were " The Supper of the Lord," and " The Holy Communion."

2. The " chasuble," which was " essentially the sacrificial vesture " (Gasquet and Bishop, " Ed. VI. and Book of Common Prayer," p. 190), was made *optional*.

The rubric directed the priest to " put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say : "a white albe plain with a vestment or cope."

This was significant, as Gasquet and Bishop rightly point out, because the cope was not specifically a sacerdotal vestment, while the " chasuble " is essentially " vestem sacerdotalem." (The Church of Rome places this vestment on her ordinands with the words : " Accipe vestem sacerdotalem.")

3. But the name " altar " was still retained, though we also find the words : " God's board " and " table."

4. " The entire portion of the Mass, constituting the act of formal oblation, together with the prayers new and old, which accompanied it, are swept away in the new service of the Prayer Book. In place of it was put a verse of Holy Scripture appropriate to what was now done ; namely the collecting of money ' for the poor man's box,' which was called the ' offertory.' "

(Gasquet and Bishop "Ed. VI. and Book of Common Prayer," p. 194.)

5. Non-communicating attendance was forbidden. There was a rubric as follows :

" So many as shall be partakers of the Holy Communion shall tarry still in the quire, or in some convenient place nigh the quire, the men on the one side, and the women on the other side. All other (that mind not to receive the said holy Communion) shall depart out of the quire, except the ministers and clerks."

6. The bread and wine were placed on the " altar " without ceremony such as had hitherto been used.

" The ancient ritual oblation with the whole of which the idea of sacrifice was so intimately associated was swept away." (Gasquet and Bishop, "Ed. VI. and Book of Common Prayer," p. 196.)

7. The old Canon of the Mass remained, however, fairly recognizable.

The clause "these gifts, these offerings, these undefiled sacrifices which we offer" was, however, omitted : and the prayer : " that they may be unto us," was substituted for the prayer in the old Sarum use " that it may be made unto us."

Probably this latter change was meant to exclude the "old learning doctrine," for Archbishop Cranmer in his " Defence " says :

" In the Book of the Holy Communion we do not pray that the creatures of bread and wine may be the body and blood of Christ, but that they may be to us the body and blood of Christ, that is to say : that we may so eat and drink that we may be partakers of His body crucified and of His blood shed for our redemption." (Cranmer "On the Lord's Supper," Park. Soc. p. 271.)

3. The third stage was the *Second Prayer Book of Edward VI.* (1552.)

Of this book, Gasquet and Bishop write thus in reference to the Holy Communion Service :

“On comparing the first with the second Communion office what is obvious at first sight is, that whilst the former, in spite of the substantial changes which had been made in the ancient Mass, manifested a general order and disposition of parts similar to the Mass itself, the latter was changed beyond recognition.” (“Ed. VI. and Book of Common Prayer,” p. 288.)

And they also add :

“The only reason which it seems possible to give (*i.e.*, for *all* the changes made) is that the innovators resolved that it should henceforth be impossible to trace in the new Communion office any resemblance, however innocuous, to the ancient Mass.” (*ibid* p. 291).

Every point upon which Bishop Gardiner had endeavoured to put a Roman gloss was altered or expunged.

1. The intercession for the living and the dead in the Canon of the Book of 1549 was held by Gardiner to allow the mass as a propitiatory sacrifice.

The intercession for the departed was altogether omitted and this portion of the Canon turned into “*The Prayer for the Church Militant here in earth,*” and transferred to an earlier portion of the service.

“What had survived in the first book of the ancient canon of the Mass was now omitted entirely with the exception of one line.” (Gasquet and Bishop, pp. 289 and 290).

2. The prayer, “With Thy Holy Spirit vouchsafe to bl~~H~~ess and sanct~~H~~ify these Thy gifts, and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ,” which was held by Gardiner to allow Transubstantiation; was entirely expunged.

3. The "Prayer of Humble Access," which, in the book of 1549, was said after the consecration by the priest kneeling, had been said by Gardiner to be an act of adoration. This prayer was accordingly placed before the Prayer of Consecration in the new book.

4. The words of administration had been pointed to by Gardiner as evidence that "the old doctrine of the Papists" was still taught, were omitted altogether and other words : "Take and eat, this," etc., substituted for them.

5. The rubric about "the whole body of our Saviour Jesus Christ" being received in each part of the bread, used again by Gardiner to support the old teaching, was omitted.

6. The word "altar," to which Gardiner also referred, was completely wiped out.

The Book of 1552 also contained the following rubric:

"And here is to be noted, that the minister at the time of the Communion and at all other times in his ministration, shall use neither alb, vestment, nor cope; but being archbishop, or bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet; and being a priest or deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only."

4. The *Fourth* stage was the *Elizabethan Book of 1559*.

This was the Book of 1552 re-enacted "with one alteration or addition of certain lessons to be used on every Sunday in the year, and the form of the litany altered and corrected, and two sentences only added in the delivery of the sacrament to the communicants, and *none other or otherwise*." (1 Eliz. cap.

2. "Documents illustrative of English Church History" by Gee and Hardy, p. 459.)

The "two sentences added in the delivery of the sacrament" were the sentences : "The body of our Lord," etc.

The Black Rubric which, as we have already noticed, was not a part of the Statutory Prayer Book of 1552, but was added to it at the last moment by an "Order in Council," was not re-enacted by the Act of Elizabeth that restored the Second Prayer Book with the three above-mentioned changes.

When, however, the printed book of 1559 issued from the Press, it contained another rubric in reference to the vesture of the clergy other than that in the Book of 1552 which had been re-enacted by the above-mentioned Act, but which was now omitted.

The new rubric ran :

"And here is to be noted, that the minister at the time of the communion and at all other times in his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the Church as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the VI., according to the act of Parliament set in the beginning of this book." (Park. Soc. Lit. Qu. Eliz. p. 53.)

The portion of the Act referred to was as follows :

"Provided always, and be it enacted that such ornaments of the church and of the ministers thereof, shall be retained and be in use, as was in the Church of England, by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI. until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the queen's majesty, with the advice of her commissioners appointed and authorized, under the great seal of England, for causes ecclesiastical, or of the metropolitan of this realm." (Gee and Hardy "Documents," p. 466).

Our present rubric is as follows :

"And here is to be noted, that such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration shall be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England, by the Authority

of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth."

It is not our purpose to discuss the vestiarian controversy here. We shall only say in the words of Mr. Tomlinson :

"The net result of the several suits has been to declare that ever since the introduction of the 'ornaments' rubric' of 1559 all ornaments of the First Prayer Book became binding by law until 1566, when the statutory 'Advertisements of Queen Elizabeth' altered that law by reducing the dress of ministration to the 'surplice' for ministers 'at all times of their administration' with a hood, according to their several degrees except in cathedral churches, for which the novel arrangement of three copes to be worn simultaneously was prescribed for use on certain occasions." ("Prayer Book, Art. and Hom. p. 92.")

The present rubric (framed in 1662 at the last revision) did not, as it has been maintained by some, re-introduce the Eucharistic Vestments. It ordered "*retention*," not "*restoration*," and to "*retain*" and "*use*" what, at the very moment the order was given was absolutely *non-existent* was an absolute impossibility. Vestments had long ago been defaced and destroyed as "*monuments of superstition*." To "*retain and use*" them was impossible. What was ordered to be "*retained and used*" was the *surplice*, ordered in the concluding rubries of First Prayer Book of Edward VI. to be used "*in the saying or singing of Matins and Evensong, Baptizing and Burying in Parish Churches and Chapels annexed to the same.*" *This* (*i.e.*, the *surplice*) and *not* the Mass Vestments was in future to be the vesture, not only on certain specified occasions as in the First Prayer Book, but "*at ALL times of ministration*," including of course the Administration of the Holy Communion.

5. The *Fifth Stage* is reached in the Revision of 1662.

The only points that call for notice here are :

1. The addition to the Prayer for the Church Militant here in earth of the thanksgiving for the faithful departed.

2. The rubric about the placing of the bread and wine upon the Table was inserted before the Prayer for the Church Militant.

3. The addition of the word “oblations” (“alms and oblations”) in the Prayer for the Church Militant. Mr. Frere, though thinking it may be legitimately referred to the elements, admits that from a “strictly antiquarian point of view” it refers to “the dues and offerings paid by the people to the clergy;” and in a note he admits that its “technical meaning,” its “strict meaning,” is “the contribution of the laity to the support of the clergy,” or, in a wider sense, “all offerings of the people other than alms for the poor.” We conclude that there is no reference, on a strict interpretation, to the elements.

4. The manual acts were restored.

5. A rubric was inserted for the reverent consumption of the consecrated elements (if any remain after the Communion) in the Church immediately after the Blessing.

It seemed best to give the stages in the compilation of the Present Communion Service continuously; but we must note that between the Fourth and Fifth Stage, there was the addition in 1604 of what is usually called the Sacramental portion of the Catechism, and that parallel to the growth of the Communion Service into its present form, there was the compilation and revision of the Articles till they also arrived at their present state.

Of the latter we must give some account.

The first set of Articles (42 in number) almost synchronized with the publication of the Second Prayer Book, being issued in 1553. In 1563 Convocation sanctioned a revision reducing the number to 38. In 1571 Queen Elizabeth sanctioned a further revision which was accepted by Convocation and passed that year. By this revision one Article (Article 29) was added, making the number 39. No further revision has taken place.

The only serious alteration that concerns our present purpose is the alteration in 1571 of part of Article 29 of 1552 (our present Article 28.)

For the clause : "Forasmuch as the truth of man's nature requireth, that the body of one and the self-same man, cannot be at one time in divers places, but must needs be in some one certain place : therefore the body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and divers places. And because (as holy Scripture doth teach) Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue unto the end of the world ; a faithful man ought not, either to believe or openly to confess, the real and bodily presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper."

There was substituted the clause :

"The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith."

Of this change Dr. Griffith Thomas says :

"It must be carefully remembered that the possible change (*i.e.*, supposing any change of doctrine to be involved) does not involve Roman doctrine as such. . The only question is as to an approximation to the Lutheran aspects of Protestant doctrine." (See "Sacrament of our Redemption," p. 67.)

I would go further and say that the change (whatever the exact reason for it may have been) does not cause our present Article even to approximate to, or be patient of Lutheran doctrine. The most representative symbol of the Lutheran Church is the "Formula Concordiae" ("Form of Concord") agreed upon and promulgated by the Lutheran Church in 1577.

In the Article on the Lord's Supper in that formula, the belief of the Lutheran Church is thus stated :

"We believe, teach and confess, that the body and blood of Christ are taken with the bread and wine, NOT *only after a spiritual manner, by faith*, but also by the mouth ; yet not in a capernaitical manner, but in a supernatural and heavenly manner, by means of the sacramental union" (Form. Concord. p. 1, Epit. loc. vii. *affirm* 6, Apud. Libr. Symbol Eccl. Luth. ed. Hase 1846, p. 600) : and the same church expressly *condemns* the doctrine

"That the Body of Christ is not taken in the Holy Supper by the mouth together with the bread, but that the bread and wine only are received by the mouth, and that the Body of Christ is taken *after a spiritual manner only, namely by faith.*" (Form. Concord. *ibid, negat* v, ib. p. 602.)

Commenting on these two passages, the late Dean Goode writes :

"The very words used in the 28th Article are here formally condemned, as opposed to the doctrine of those who maintained an oral eating of the Body of Christ in the Supper ; for which, as common to all the communicants, the authors of the Formula Concordiae earnestly contended." ("On the Eucharist," vol. ii. p. 648).

Our present Article, then, cannot rightly be said to be capable of a Lutheran interpretation. The words of the clause as we now have it "exclude the

notion of the Body of Christ being in or with or under the bread so as to be swallowed by the mouth ; because not merely do they affirm, that the Body is given, taken and eaten, "ONLY after a heavenly and spiritual manner," but expressly state that " THE MEAN whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is FAITH." (See Dean Goode "On the Eucharist," vol. ii., p. 649.)

The same writer (*i.e.*, Dean Goode) thinks that some of the Revisers of the Articles at the last revision of them held that the paragraph as it stood in the Article of 1552 might be thought to deny, not only the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ *in* the consecrated elements—a doctrine which the Church of England emphatically denies in her Authorized Formularies as we have them to-day—but also the presence of Christ *in the rite*—a totally different thing—and that for this reason it was thought best to omit the paragraph and insert another couched in more guarded phraseology. The fact that at the time of the change there were some whose language seemed to imply, that in the Lord's Supper, there was a real *substantial* presence of Christ's Body and Blood *in the rite* to the *faithful* communicant—(a view which the late Dean Goode called " a harmless though incorrect notion ")—may have influenced the alteration of the paragraph and the substitution of words "that guarded the doctrine of the Lord's Supper in all essential points."

The alteration in the Article is not really so important as is sometimes stated because as a matter of fact the doctrine contained in the omitted paragraph of the 1552 Article, for which our present paragraph was substituted, is fully set forth in the " Black Rubric," which, with one verbal alteration of no doctrinal significance, was finally re-inserted at the last revision

of the Book of Common Prayer in 1662 with the full sanction alike of Convocation and Parliament.

At the same time it is well to remember that the Article as it now stands, taken by itself, is not capable of even a Lutheran interpretation, but is in perfect harmony with the whole scheme of Church of England teaching on the subject of the Lord's Supper as set forth in her Authorized Formularies taken as a whole.

Having now reviewed the stages by which the Church of England has arrived at her present doctrinal statements concerning the Lord's Supper, we are now in a position rightly to estimate from her formularies, *i.e.*, from the Communion Service, Catechism, and Articles, what her doctrine on this subject really is. This therefore we shall now proceed to do.

CHAPTER VI

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ON
THE LORD'S SUPPER AS GATHERED FROM HER AUTHORIZED
FORMULARIES.

1. The Church of England knows no “altar.” The word, as we have seen, has been deliberately expunged from her Book of Common Prayer as applied to the Lord’s Table. And it is a matter of history that in 1550, even before the issue of the Second Prayer Book in which the word “altar” for the first time disappeared altogether, headed by Bishop Ridley, who broke down the high altar in his own Cathedral Church of St. Paul, and set up a table there, there broke out what has well been called “The Altar War,” and altars were destroyed throughout the country with the greatest rapidity. The Church of England ministers the Lord’s Supper at a “Table,” *not* at an “altar.” In the Communion Service as we have it in our present Book of Common Prayer, mention is made no less than 16 times of the “table,” never once of the “altar;” thus :

“The Lord’s Table,” (7 times); “the table,” (4 times); “the holy table,” (3 times); “Thy table,” (twice).

2. The Church of England possesses no “sacerdos” or “sacrificing priest.” The term “priest” in the Prayer Book is simply a shortened form of “presbyter,” and is not the equivalent of “sacerdos.” A comparison of the Latin version of Articles 31 and 32

makes this clear. In Article 31 where the Roman priest is spoken of the word "sacerdos" is used; but in Article 32 where mention is made of the Second Order of the Ministry in the Church of England, the word "presbyter" is used, *not* "sacerdotes." A further proof is that the words in the old Sarum Ordinal: "Receive power to offer sacrifice to God and to celebrate Mass both for the living and for the dead," were entirely expunged from the Reformed Ordinal together with all trace of the bestowal of sacrificial powers.

3. The Church of England has no specifically Eucharistic Vestments. That which is essentially the sacrificial garment of the Roman Church, namely the chasuble, she has altogether discarded.

This is undoubtedly a much disputed point, but without going into the controversy as to the Vestments, which would be beyond the scope of our present subject, we may say this much, that whatever theories of the "Ornaments' Rubric" individuals may hold, it is still unquestionably the law of the land that the Church of England does not prescribe, but repudiates what are commonly called "The Eucharistic Vestments," or "The Mass Vestments."

The decision to this effect was given in 1877 "after great elaboration of argument, by a court of exceptional strength,"—the highest court that has jurisdiction in matters ecclesiastical—in what is commonly known as "The Ridsdale Case." (See "Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline," p. 61, paragraph 339).

4. The Church of England believes in no sacrifice—in the sense of a propitiatory or remissory sacrifice, either for the living or the dead—in the Lord's Supper.

Article 31 is most explicit on this point.

It is as follows :

"The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual ; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits."

An attempt is sometimes made to show that what is condemned in this Article is not "the sacrifice of the Mass" as such, but some popular theory that was current at the time concerning "the Sacrifices of Masses;" but an examination of the whole Article, shows this interpretation to be nothing else than an evasion of its real meaning. The description given in the Article of "the Sacrifices of Masses," is exactly the description applied to the Sacrifice of the Mass in the Decree of the Council of Trent (Session 22, chap. ii. See "Cramp's Text Book of Popery," p. 260.) Indeed Canon 4 of this Session of the Council of Trent, which was held in 1562, subsequent to the publication of the Forty-Two Articles of 1553 (of which our present 31st Article was the 30th Article) seems distinctly to refer to the Article. The Canon is as follows : "If anyone shall say that by the Sacrifice of the Mass, a *blasphemy* is cast upon the most holy sacrifice of Christ, accomplished on the cross, or that the former derogates from the glory of the latter, let him be accursed." (Cramp's "Text-Book of Popery," p. 452.)

It is sometimes said that the Doctrines of Trent on this subject cannot be condemned by this Article, as its publication was previous to the issue of the Canons and Decrees of Trent concerning the Mass. In reply to this it is sufficient to point out the Council of Trent did not so much formulate a new doctrine as stereotype

what was already the well-known doctrine of the Roman Church.

A quotation from the "Vindication of the Bull 'Apostolical Curiae,'" issued in 1897 by the Roman Catholic Cardinal Archbishop and Bishops in England will be a useful conclusion on this point.

On p. 67 (3rd Edit.) of that "Vindication" we read :

" Article xxxi. pronounces on the Mass. It first describes it by a definition which every Catholic would accept, 'the Sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead,' and then denounces it—it, so described—as incompatible with the offering of Christ once made on the Cross."

5. According to the teaching of the Church of England, there is no identification of the bread and wine with the body and blood of Christ, so that the substance of the bread and wine is changed into the substance of the body and blood.

Article 28 distinctly says : " Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy writ; but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions."

And in the "Black" Rubric we read : " The Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still (*i.e.*, after Consecration) in their very natural substances . . . and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven and not here ; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one."

6. The Church of England believes in no presence of the Body and Blood of Christ *in* the consecrated elements.

The "Black" Rubric already referred to distinctly denies any "corporal presence," *i.e.*, any presence of the "corpus" or "body" of Christ, whether "glorified" or "unglorified" (for a "glorified" or "spiritual" body is still a "corpus"), in the Consecrated Elements.

The attempt has sometimes been made to show that the "corporal presence," which is denied in this Rubric, is *only* a *material* presence. But in reply it is sufficient to point out that such a theory is untenable, because such a "material presence"—a presence, that is, according to our Lord's natural mode of existence—is a presence that no one—not even the Church of Rome—affirms. (See "Decrees of the Council of Trent," in "Cramp's Text-Book of Popery," Sess. 13, chap. 1, p. 148.)

What is denied in this Rubric is the presence of the "corpus," or Body of Christ, whether "spiritually," *i.e.*, in a spiritual manner, or "supernaturally," or "materially."

Further on the point before us. According to the teaching of the Church of England what is delivered to each communicant is *bread* and *wine*.

The Rubric previous to the actual administration (and after the consecration,) says: "When he delivereth the *bread* to anyone he shall say."

And what is received by each communicant is *bread* and *wine*. Part of the consecration prayer, considered by us already in another connection, makes this clear. It runs as follows:

"Grant that we, receiving these *thy creatures* of *bread* and *wine*, according to *Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's* holy institution in memory of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed body and blood."

The Bread and Wine are more than once called

"bread" and "wine," after Consecration, *e.g.*, Rubric before the Administration already referred to, and Rubric after which speaks of "the consecrated Bread or Wine;" and the "Black" Rubric speaks of the "Sacramental Bread or Wine there (*i.e.*, in the sacrament) bodily received."

7. The Church of England forbids Adoration of the Consecrated Elements; which forbidding follows naturally from the view just stated under heading 6.

If Christ's Body and Blood be not in the elements when consecrated, then to worship or adore them is idolatry, as the Church of Rome herself admits. ("De Defectu Intentionis," in Roman Missal, sect. vii.)

The declaration on kneeling or the "Black" Rubric, to which reference has already been made more than once, distinctly says that by the posture of "kneeling" at reception of the sacrament "no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances and therefore may not be adored; (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians.)"

Article 28 says that "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up or worshipped."

8. This leads us to another point, *i.e.*, that the Church of England forbids Reservation and Elevation. See Article 28 quoted above.

Support of this is found in the Rubric at the close of the Communion Service, directing that anything that remains of the Consecrated Bread or Wine is to be "reverently" consumed by the Priest, and if necessary some of those who have communicated, *immediately* after the Blessing.

As to the latter point, "Elevation," the language of the Article is clear and it is a matter of History that "Elevation" was distinctly prohibited in the "order of Communion" of 1548 and was never since re-enjoined.

9. The Church of England does not believe in Communion without Communicants, nor does she believe in the presence during the actual Communion of those who do not communicate.

The whole purpose of the Reformers was "to turn the Mass into a Communion."

Article 25 distinctly says : "The Sacraments were *not* ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, *but* that we should duly use them. And in such only as receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation."

At the close of the Communion Service there is a Rubric that forbids a celebration of the Lord's Supper except "four (or at the least three) communicate with the priest."

As we have seen before, it is a matter of history that in the Prayer Book of 1549 (Rubric) and in the Prayer Book of 1552 (Exhortation) all not intending to communicate were bidden to depart. So effective was this command repeated in the Exhortation in the Prayer Books of 1559 and 1604 that by the time of the last revision in 1662 the practice of non-communicating attendance had become so obsolete, that the repetition of the command to all not intending to communicate to depart, was not found necessary to be repeated.

10. Confession is no longer, as in the Roman Church, required preparatory to reception of the Holy Communion. Indeed in the *Roman* sense, confession is unknown in the Church of England authorized formularies. As a special means of preparation for

reception of the Holy Communion by one who "cannot" otherwise "quiet his own conscience," the Church of England allows what is sometimes called "confession," but which is better called "consultation." We have treated the subject at length in connection with the Exhortation in the Communion Service.

11. The Church of England nowhere enjoins "Fasting" as a necessary preliminary to reception of the Holy Communion.

In fact the Convocation of Canterbury declared in 1893, that :

"To teach that it is a sin to communicate otherwise than fasting, is contrary to the teaching and spirit of the Church of England." (Quoted in "The Churchman's A.B.C.," edited by Dr. Griffith Thomas.)

We have seen now very fully what we might call the *Negative* side of the Teaching of the Church of England on the Lord's Supper. We must pass now to the more *Positive* side.

I. As we study the formularies of the Church of England that deal with this subject, we perceive that the two leading ideas in the Doctrine of the Church of England on the Lord's Supper are :

1. "Remembrance."
2. "Spiritual Feeding."

1. "*Remembrance.*"

That this idea predominates cannot rightly be denied.

In the Holy Communion Service itself, this same idea occurs no less than ten times.

(1.) In the first of the Long Exhortations or notices we have the words : "to be by them received *in remembrance* of His meritorious Cross and Passion."

(2.) In the *second* of these, we have : "it is your duty to receive the Communion, *in remembrance* of the sacrifice of His death, as He Himself hath commanded."

(3.) In the Longer Exhortation at the actual administration, we read : "to the end that we should *always remember* the exceeding great love of our Master, and only Saviour, Jesus Christ, thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which by His precious blood-shedding He hath obtained to us ; He hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of His love and :

(4.) *For a continual remembrance of His death to our great and endless comfort.*"

(5.) In the Prayer of Consecration we have :

"In His holy Gospel commanded us to continue, *a perpetual memory* of that His precious death, until His coming again."

And

(6.) "Grant that we receiving these Thy creatives of bread and wine, according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, *in remembrance* of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed body and blood."

And (quoting the words of Institution) :

(7.) "Do this *in remembrance* of me."

And

(8.) "Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, *in remembrance* of me."

(9.) In the Words of Administration we have :

"Take, and eat this *in remembrance* that Christ died for thee. . . ."

And

(10.) "Drink this *in remembrance* that Christ's Blood was shed for thee. . . ."

And in the Catechism the answer to the question :

"Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained ? "

is most definite. It runs thus :

"*For the continual remembrance* of the sacrifice of the

death of Christ and of the benefits which we receive thereby."

2. *Spiritual Feeding.*

The second leading idea is the idea of spiritual feeding with a view to spiritual refreshment, strength and sustenance.

In the Communion Service we have the following :

(1.) In the first of the Long Exhortations or notices we read :

" Almighty God our heavenly Father . . . hath given His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our *spiritual food and sustenance* in that holy Sacrament."

(2.) In the Longer Exhortation at the actual administration we find the words :

" For as the benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy Sacrament ; (for then we *spiritually eat* the flesh of Christ, and drink His blood ; then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us ; with us;) so is the danger great if we receive the same unworthily."

(3.) In the Second Post-Communion Prayer we give thanks thus :

" Almighty and everlasting God, we most heartily thank Thee, for that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, *with the spiritual food* of the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ."

In the Catechism the answer to the question, concerning the Lord's Supper : " What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby ? " is

" The *strengthening and refreshing of our souls* by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the Bread and Wine."

And in the 25th Article it is said of both the Sacra-
ments that they are " certain sure witnesses and

effectual signs of grace (*i.e.*, “they do the work of signs effectually,”—Moule), and God’s good will towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but *also strengthen and confirm our Faith in Him.*”

II. The Lord’s Supper is also, the Church of England teaches us, a means of union with Christ, when rightly used.

“The benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy Sacrament; (for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink His blood; then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us).” (Longer Exhortation in Communion Service).

III. Spiritual partaking of Christ in that holy Sacrament is a means of cleansing and preservation both of body and soul.

In the Prayer of Humble Access we pray :

“Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ and to drink His blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him and He in us.”

And in the words of Administration we say :

“The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.”

And

“The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.”

IV. The Church of England further teaches us that the Lord’s Supper is a pledge of the Love of God to us and an assurance of our membership in the mystical

Body of His Son, and of our heirship in His everlasting kingdom.

In the Longer Exhortation in the Communion Service we read :

“ Our Master and only Saviour Jesus Christ . . . hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, *as pledges of His love* and for a continual remembrance of His death, to our great and endless comfort.”

In the second of the Post-Communion Thanksgiving Prayers we say that God by these holy mysteries doth “ *assure us* of His favour and goodness towards us ; and that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of His Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people ; and are also heirs through hope of His everlasting kingdom, by the merits of the most precious death and passion of His dear Son.”

In the Catechism (the answer to the question “ What meanest thou by this word Sacrament ? ”) we are told of both the Sacraments that they are “ *a pledge to assure us thereof*,” i.e., of the “ inward and spiritual grace ” of God, of which they are “ a means ” of our reception.

In Article 25 we read (again of both the Sacraments) that they are “ certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace, and God’s good will towards us.”

V. In the teaching of the Church of England the Lord’s Supper is a Sacrifice, but ONLY in the following senses.

- (a) A “ Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving,” i.e., a sacrifice consisting in praise and thanksgiving.
- (b) A Sacrifice of Self-Dedication. “ And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice unto Thee.” (1st Post-Communion Prayer of Thanksgiving).

VI. The Lord's Supper is also, in its observance by us, a public profession of Christ.

Article 25 says of both the Sacraments that they are, amongst other things—not only this, but this amongst other things—“badges or tokens of Christian men's profession.”

VII. And it is also a reminder as we observe it from time to time of our Union with one another in Christ.

Article 28 says that the Lord's Supper is amongst other things—not only this, but this amongst other things—“a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another.”

VIII. The Church of England further teaches that the *only* means whereby we partake of Christ's Body and Blood in the Lord's Supper is *Faith*.

We have already noticed the passages where a spiritual feeding is emphasized.

In addition to these, which imply this truth, note

(1.) *The Words of Administration*: “feed on Him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving.”

(2.) In the *Catechism* in answer to the question concerning the Lord's Supper, “What is the inward part or thing signified ?” we have the following :

“The Body and Blood of Christ which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.”

(3.) In Article 28 we have the words : “The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, *only* after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is *faith*.”

Stress is sometimes laid on the fact that in quotations (2) and (3) under this head the Body and Blood of Christ are spoken of as “given,” “taken” and “received” in that Supper ; and it is argued from this

that the Church of England believes in a real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ IN the consecrated elements.

This is an unwarrantable deduction and could not be made if the whole paragraph in each case was studied as a whole.

In quotation (2) those who "take" and "receive" the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper are—NOT *all* the communicants—but only "THE FAITHFUL."

In quotation (3) the words "given, taken and eaten" are carefully explained by the words that follow : "*only* after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And *the mean* whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is *faith*."

It may not be amiss to quote here at length the very able summary of the truth about this matter given by Dr. Griffith Thomas in his book : "A Sacrament of our Redemption," pp. 68 and 69. He says :

"There is historical proof that one of the Elizabethan Bishops (Cheney of Gloucester) held distinct Lutheran views on the Lord's Supper. He was supported generally by Bishop Geste, who was the author of the new paragraph of the Article about 'The Body of Christ.' Our present article 29 was the work of Archbishop Parker, a great admirer of Cranmer and a decided Protestant. Through him this Article (29) was included in the revision by Convocation in 1563, though it did not appear in any of the printed copies. We may fairly attribute this to the influence of those who favoured a policy of comprehension, and the avoidance of offence to any and all who could see their way to accept a general Protestant position. The matter was thus a subject of controversy, as contemporary evidence shows. Parker was certainly not Lutheran in views, and he opposed Bishops Cheney and Geste. Cheney could not accept the word 'only'

in the new paragraph ; ‘ The Body of Christ is given . . . *only* after an heavenly and spiritual manner,’ and in order to meet his scruples Geste wished the word omitted, though he himself justified it as simply intended to guard against ‘ the grossness and sensibleness in receiving’ Christ’s body. Geste also proposed the insertion of the word ‘ profitably ’ after ‘ received and taken.’ Archbishop Parker evidently realized that Article 28 would be insufficient as a safeguard against Lutheran doctrine and that something more was needed. In 1573 he carried his point and our present Article 29 was added. Geste now admitted the insuperable difference between Lutheran and Church of England doctrine. His testimony is conclusive as to the facts of the case. Instead of gaining his point by the insertion of the word ‘ profitably,’ in Article 28, the matter was decided against him by the addition of Article 29. In view of prevalent misconceptions about Bishop Geste it ought to be added that he was in other respects by no means the type of churchman that some modern writers would suggest, and on certain points, such as Adoration, was unmistakably Protestant.

“ The word ‘ given ’ in the new clause of Article 28 is sometimes asserted to prove Lutheran doctrine, but it seems to be forgotten that the explanation ‘ only after a heavenly and spiritual manner ’ covers the whole phrase ‘ given, taken and eaten.’ The ‘ gift ’ must therefore surely be from our Lord Himself and the reception and eating by means of our faith. The word ‘ given ’ is thus applied to our Lord not only by Cranmer and Jewel, but also even by men who held the ‘ Reformed ’ views like Calvin. Further, the very phrase of the Article is found in Nowell’s smaller ‘ Catechism ’ of whose doctrinal character and position there is no question.”

This quotation seems to put the whole case in a nutshell, and should be conclusive as to the meaning of the words of the Article.

IX. This feast is, according to the teaching of the Church of England, only for those who are in real living union with the Lord Jesus Christ—*i.e.*, only for “believers” (to use the earliest title by which Christians were known. See Acts ii. 44, v. 14, etc.); and only they are “worthy” or “meet” partakers of that Sacred Feast.

In the Communion Service we have the following :

(1.) In the first of the Long Exhortations or notices the clergyman in giving notice of the administration of the Holy Communion, says : “Dearly beloved, on —day next I purpose, through God’s assistance to administer to all such as shall be religiously and devoutly disposed the most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.”

This statement is not so explicit as some, but is amplified and more fully explained by others that follow.

(2.) In the same Exhortation the people are exhorted “to search and examine their own consciences (and that not lightly, and after the manner of dissemblers with God ; but so) that *they may come holy and clean to such a heavenly feast, in the marriage garment required by God in holy Scripture*, and be received as worthy partakers of that holy Table.”

(3.) In the Longer Exhortation at the actual administration the words occur :

“Judge therefore yourselves, brethren, that ye be not judged of the Lord ; *repent you truly for your sins past ; have a lively and stedfast faith in Christ our Saviour ; amend your lives, and be in perfect charity with all men ; so shall ye be meet partakers of those holy mysteries.*”

(4.) The Shorter Exhortation contains the same truth.

"Ye that do *truly and earnestly repent* you of your sins, and are in *love and charity* with your neighbours, and *intend to lead a new life*, following the commandments of God and walking from henceforth in His holy ways; *draw near with faith*, and take this holy Sacrament to your comfort." . . .

In the Catechism in answer to the question, "What is required of them who come to the Lord's Supper?" we are told the requirements:

"To examine themselves, whether they *repent truly* of their former sins, *stedfastly purposing to lead a new life*; have *a lively faith in God's mercy through Christ*, with a *thankful remembrance* of his death; and *be in charity* with all men."

From these passages it is clear that the Church of England teaches that those who come to the Lord's Supper should be REAL Christians, i.e., men and women who have:

1. REPENTANCE.
2. FAITH.
3. STEDFAST PURPOSE OF AMENDMENT OF LIFE.
4. THANKFUL HEARTS (FOR THE DEATH OF CHRIST).
5. LOVE (to *all* men).

The Rubric after the Confirmation Service:

"And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion until such time as he be confirmed or be ready and desirous to be confirmed,"

is in perfect harmony with the above, for a true Confirmation pre-supposes all the above qualifications: (see the Confirmation Service where those about to be confirmed are spoken of as God's "servants" whom He has "vouchsafed to regenerate by water and the

holy Ghost," and to whom He has "given" the "forgiveness of all their sins.")

X. The Church of England further teaches that only such persons as come with the qualifications above described (under ix) get any benefit by communicating.

In the Longer Exhortation in the Communion Service we read :

"For as the benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that Holy Sacrament (for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood ; then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us ; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us ;) so is the danger great if we receive the same unworthily."

Article 25, speaking of both Sacraments, says :

"In such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation."

In Article 28 we read :

"To such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same (*i.e.*, the Sacramental Bread an Wine), the bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ."

XI. None who lack the essential qualifications are to draw near to that holy Supper.

In the first of the Long Exhortations or Notices in the Communion Service we read :

"If any of you be a blasphemer of God, an hinderer or slanderer of His Word, an adulterer, or be in malice, or envy, or in any other greivous crime, repent you of your sins, or else come not to that holy Table."

And again :

"It is requisite, that no man should come to the holy Communion but with a full trust in God's mercy, and with a quiet conscience."

In the second of these Exhortations “greivous sinners” are only exhorted to come after they “repent and amend.”

XII. If any draw near without the qualifications enumerated above, *i.e.*, without :

1. Repentance.
2. Faith.
3. Stedfast purpose of amendment of life.
4. Thankfulness.
5. Love.

they get no benefit whatever by partaking, but only incur judgment upon themselves.

In the first of the Long Exhortations or Notices in the Communion Service intending communicants are warned :

“Examine your lives and conversations by the rule of God’s commandments ; and whereinsoever ye shall perceive yourselves to have offended, either by will, word or deed, there to bewail your own sinfulness, and to confess yourselves to Almighty God, with full purpose of amendment of life. And if ye shall perceive your offences to be such as are not only against God, but also against your neighbours ; then ye shall reconcile yourselves unto them: being ready to make restitution and satisfaction, according to the uttermost of your powers, for all injuries and wrongs done by you to any other ; and being likewise ready to forgive others that have offended you, as ye would have forgiveness of your offences at God’s hand : for otherwise the receiving of the holy Communion doth nothing else but increase your damnation.” And again in the same exhortation we are told that coming when guilty of any “greivous crime” or sin may “bring” such a one “to destruction both of body and soul.”

The Longer Exhortation at the actual administration also warns that, “so is the danger great if we

receive the same unworthily. For then we are guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ our Saviour ; we eat and drink our own damnation, not considering the Lord's Body ; we kindle God's wrath against us ; we provoke Him to plague us with divers diseases and sundry kinds of death."

Article 25 says in reference to both the Sacraments :

" They that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation as Saint Paul saith."

Article 29 says that " the wicked and such as be void of a lively faith . . . in no wise are partakers of Christ ; but rather to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing." (i.e., the sign or sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ).

XIII. According to the teaching of the Church of England none partake of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper who lack faith. She cannot therefore believe in any Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ *in* the consecrated elements independently of the faith of the recipient.

Article 29 is most explicit : " The wicked and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet *in no wise* are they partakers of Christ : but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing."

Article 28 implies the same thing. It says that " to such as rightly, worthily and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ, and likewise the cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ." Now this distinctly implies that to those who do not partake " rightly, worthily, and with faith " " the bread which we break " is *not* " a partaking of the Body of Christ,"

nor “the cup of blessing” “a partaking of the Blood of Christ.”

If there was a real objective Presence of Christ’s flesh and blood *in* the consecrated elements (whether by the bread and wine being transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ or by the body and blood of Christ being present under the “form” or “veil” of bread and wine) by virtue of the consecration, the moment consecration had taken place, then all the communicants, “the wicked and such as be void of a lively faith” included, would, in some sense, be partakers of Christ. But the Church of England says most clearly that “the wicked and such as be void of a lively faith” are “IN NO WISE partakers of Christ.” On the theories supposed above, whether that of transubstantiation or that of the real objective Presence “in, with or under” the consecrated bread and wine, “the wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith” would in some sense (what the Roman Church would call “sacramentally”) partake of Christ. This the Church of England distinctly says they “IN NO WISE” do. She clearly therefore does not hold that the Body and Blood of Christ are present in *any* way *in* the consecrated elements by virtue of the act of consecration.

XIV. In the teaching of the Church of England “the outward part or sign” and “the inward part or thing signified” are quite *distinct*.

The Catechism teaches us that there are “*two parts*” to a Sacrament : “the outward visible sign” and “the inward spiritual grace;” and it asks : “What is the outward part or sign of the Lord’s Supper ?” and replies : “Bread and Wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received.” “What is the inward part or thing signified ?” and the reply is : “The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily

and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

There is not the slightest hint anywhere in the Church of England authoritative formularies that the "sign" and the "thing signified" are in any sense identified.

A sign which became identified (even partially) with the thing signified would cease to be a sign. And what need could there be of a sign if the thing signified were really present as "a great objective Reality?"

The Church of England considers the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper to be "the outward part or sign," and nowhere teaches that they become in anyway identified with the thing signified.

If there was an identification whole or partial of the Bread and Wine with the Body and Blood of Christ, of which they are the symbols and the sign,—if the consecrated Bread and Wine had "in, with or under" them the Body and Blood of Christ, then all who receive the one would receive the other, which, as we have seen, is decidedly *not* the teaching of the Church of England. According to the teaching of the Church of England, not all who receive the Bread and Wine, receive the Body and Blood of Christ, therefore the Church of England cannot hold any theory of the identification, whole or partial of the Sacramental Bread and Wine with the Body and Blood of Christ, or believe that the Body and Blood of Christ are "really present under the 'form' or 'veil' of Bread and Wine."

XV. The Church of England teaches that to communicate is a Christian *duty*, and that those who communicate are to receive "in both kinds."

In the Second of the Longer Exhortations or Notices in the Communion Service we read: "It is *your duty* to receive the Communion in remembrance of

the sacrifice of His death, as He Himself hath commanded.'

In the first of the Post-Communion Thanksgiving Prayers we ask God "to accept *this our bounden duty and service*; not weighing our merits but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Not to fulfil this duty, to "wilfully abstain from the Lord's Table" is to "do injury to God" and incur the risk of "sore punishment." (See Second of the Longer Exhortations or Notices).

As to the reception in both kinds the Rubric before the Words of Administration in the Communion Service orders administration "in both kinds;" and Article 30 expressly declares :

"The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people, for both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike."

XVI. While the Church of England teaches that in the reception of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper the true believer in the Lord Jesus Christ really and truly partakes of the Body and Blood of Christ, by faith, to his soul's health; she at the same time clearly teaches that this spiritual feeding may take place apart altogether from the reception of the Sacrament, showing that the spiritual feeding in the Lord's Supper is in no way different from that which takes place by the use of other means of grace.

This is clearly seen in the Rubric at the close of "the Communion of the Sick," which says :

"If a man, either by reason of extremity of sickness, or for want of warning in due time to the curate, or for lack of company to receive with him (it might be noted here that even in the case of the Communion of the sick, except in times of plague or "such other like contagious times of sickness or diseases," there must

be “ three or two at the least ” to communicate with the sick person), or by any other just impediment, do not receive the Sacrament of Christ’s Body and Blood, the curate shall instruct him, that if he do truly repent him of his sins, and stedfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the Cross for him, and shed his blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving him hearty thanks therefore, he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul’s health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth.”

We have now considered very fully the teaching of the Church of England on the Lord’s Supper. Before we pass on to compare this teaching with that of Scripture, the Primitive Church and the Church of Rome, four quotations—one from Archbishop Cranmer, one from Bishop Jewel, one from Richard Hooker, and one from Bishop Jeremy Taylor—will be helpful in throwing still further light on the teaching of the Church of England.

1. Archbishop Cranmer said :

“ *They* (*i.e.*, the Papists as they were then often called) *say* that Christ is corporally under or in the form of bread and wine. *We say* that *Christ is not there, neither corporally nor spiritually*; but in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine He is spiritually, and corporally in heaven.” (Cranmer “On the Lord’s Supper,” Park. Soc. p. 54).

2. Bishop Jewel said :

“ Three things herein we must consider : first, that we put a difference between the sign and the thing itself that is signified. Secondly, that we seek Christ above in heaven, and imagine not Him to be present bodily upon the earth. Thirdly, that the body of

Christ is to be eaten by faith only, and none otherwise."

(Park. Soc. " Works of Bishop Jewel," " Sermon and Harding," p. 449).

3. Richard Hooker said :

" The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament. And with this the very order of our Saviour's words agreeth, first ' Take and eat ; ' then, ' This is My Body which was broken for you ; ' first, ' drink ye all of this ; ' then followeth ' This is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.' I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ when and where the bread is His body, or the cup His blood ; but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them. As for the sacraments, they really exhibit, but for aught we can gather out of that which is written of them, they are not really, nor do really contain in themselves, that grace which with them, or by them it pleaseth God to bestow." (" Ecclesiastical Polity," Book V. c. 67).

4. Bishop Jeremy Taylor said :

" We say that Christ's body is in the Sacrament really, but spiritually. The Roman Catholics say that it is there really but spiritually. For so Bellarmine is bold to say that the word may be allowed in this question. Where now is the difference ? Here by ' spiritually,' *they* mean spiritual after the manner of a spirit. *We* by ' spiritually' mean present to our spirit only. They say that Christ's body is truly present there as it was upon the cross, but not after the manner of all or any body, but after that manner of being as an angel is in a place. That's *their* ' spiritually.' But *we* by the real spiritual presence of Christ do understand Christ to be present, as the spirit of God is present, in the hearts of the faithful, by blessing

and grace ; and this is all which we mean beside the tropocal and figurative presence." ("On the Real Presence," edit. 1654, pp. 13—15.)

These four quotations cover the three great periods during which the Doctrine of the Church of England on the Lord's Supper was being formulated and stereotyped in her authoritative formularies—*i.e.*, the period of the Reformation Divines, the period of the Elizabethan Divines, and the period of the Caroline Divines. An examination of these four quotations is sufficient to show that the teaching of the Caroline Divines (as could be proved by a more detailed examination) "in no way differed from that of the earlier Reformers."

A paragraph from Archbishop Cranmer, which was referred to in the consideration of the teaching of the Church of Rome in the Decrees of the Council of Trent (sess. 13, cl. viii.) may fitly be inserted here.

It is as follows :

" There is a spiritual eating only, when Christ by a true faith is eaten without the sacrament ; also there is another eating both spiritual and sacramental, when the visible sacrament is eaten with the mouth, and Christ Himself is eaten with a true faith ; the third eating is sacramentally only, when the Sacrament is eaten and not Christ Himself. So that in the first Christ is eaten without the sacrament; in the second He is eaten with the sacrament ; and in the third the sacrament is eaten without Him ; and therefore it is called sacramental eating only because only the sacrament is eaten, and not Christ Himself. After the two first manner of ways godly men do eat, who feed and live by Christ ; the third manner of ways the wicked do eat ; and therefore, as St. Augustine saith : ' they neither eat Christ's flesh nor drink His blood, although every day they eat the sacrament thereof

to the condemnation of their presumption," (Cranmer "On the Lord's Supper," Park. Soc. p. 205), and on the so-called "Spiritual Presence" *in* the consecrated elements, *i.e.*, the presence "in, with or under" the "forms" or "veils" of Bread and Wine, of "the spiritual body" of Christ, as it is called, we may add the words of Bishop Morley (who, as one of the Revisers of the Prayer Book at the last revision in 1662, procured the re-introduction of the "Black" Rubric in its present form, at the end of the Communion Service) as follows :

"A body cannot be a body and no body, as it must be if it were a spirit; and nothing can have the presence or propriety of a spirit but a spirit, and, consequently, nothing can be anywhere as a spirit but a spirit." ("Vindication of the Argument from Sense," 1683, p. 26).

And it must be remembered in this connection that it was not His spiritual or glorified body that our Lord gave to His disciples at the Institution of the Lord's Supper, but His Body "broken" (*κλάμενον* lit. "being broken") "given" (*διδόμενον* lit. "being given") and His Blood "shed" (*ἐκχυνόμενον* lit. "being shed") Our Lord's "glorified" or "spiritual" body did not *then* (*i.e.*, at the Institution) exist and therefore could not be present "in, with, or under" the sacramental bread and wine. If it be His "glorified" or "spiritual" body "in, with or under" the "form" or "veil" of bread and wine, which is given to each communicant now in the Sacrament, then the gift in the Sacrament now is not the same as the gift at the original institution.

But in the Sacrament now as then the gift is the same. The Lord feeds His faithful ones with His Body "broken" and His Blood "shed," *i.e.*, enables them by faith to be partakers of the benefits of His

precious Death for them. This gift cannot be located *in* the elements because "in the Calvary state," *i.e.*, as "broken" and "shed," that Body and Blood no longer exist and therefore cannot be locally present anywhere.

The only presence in the Sacrament is a Spiritual Presence to the heart of the faithful recipient.

CHAPTER VII

“A COMPARISON OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND WITH THE TEACHING OF SCRIPTURE OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH AND OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.”

It remains for us now only to compare the Doctrine of the Church of England with the Teaching of Scripture, of the Primitive Church, and of the Church of Rome.

The likeness or the contrast can best be seen, I think, by means of a parallel tabulation, such as the following :

HOLY SCRIPTURE AND THE APOSTOLIC AGE.	THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH (to the end of Sixth Century)	THE CHURCH OF ROME.	THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.
1. Simplicity of Ritual.	<p>1. Simplicity of Ritual. (Traces of slight increase towards the close of this period.)</p> <p>2. Table.</p> <p>3. Presbyter No Sacrificing Priest.</p>	<p>1. Elaborate Ceremonial.</p> <p>2. Altar.</p> <p>3. Presbyter and <i>leperus</i> (<i>leperus</i> sacrificing Priest, becoming frequent from close of 4th century onwards.)</p> <p>4. No specific Eucharistic or Sacrificial Vestment.</p>	<p>1. Simplicity of Ritual.</p> <p>2. Table.</p> <p>3. Presbyter. ("Priest" in the Book of Common Prayer is only "Presbyter" writ short. The Church of England in her authorized formularies knows of no sacrificing Priest; i.e., does not consider her clergy to be such.)</p> <p>4. No specific Eucharistic or Sacrificial Vestment. (Whatever theories individuals may hold, this is at present the law as declared by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the highest of the courts that have jurisdiction in matters ecclesiastical.)</p>

HOLY SCRIPTURE AND THE APOSTOLIC AGE.	THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH (to the end of Sixth Century)	THE CHURCH OF ROME.	THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.
5. No idea or trace of Propitiatory Sacrifice in the Lord's Supper.	5. Traces of the idea of Propitiatory Sacrifice creeping in by the end of the 4th or beginning of the 5th Century.	5. Propitiatory Sacrifice the leading idea.	5. No idea or trace of or belief in a Propitiatory Sacrifice in the Lord's Supper.
6. No such Doctrine taught as the Identification of the Bread and Wine with the Body and Blood of Christ so that the Substance of the Bread and Wine is changed into the Substance of the Body and Blood.	6. No such Doctrine.	6. After Consecration the Substance of Bread and Wine entirely disappear, being transubstantiated into the Body and Blood of Christ.	6. Nosuch doctrine taught, on the contrary it is explicitly denied. (See Article 28).
7. No presence of the Body and Blood of Christ <i>in</i> the consecrated elements or "with or under" them taught anywhere, as the result of consecration.	7. No such Doctrine.	7. Immediately after consecration, the true Body and Blood of Christ, together with His soul and divinity, exists under the species of Bread and Wine. Christ whole and entire exists under the species of bread and in every particle thereof, and under the species of wine and in all its parts.	7. No presence of the Body and Blood of Christ (whether as "glorified" or "unglorified") " <i>in</i> , with, or under" the Sacramental Bread and Wine by virtue of the act of consecration.

HOLY SCRIPTURE AND THE APOSTOLIC AGE.	THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH (to the end of Sixth Century)	THE CHURCH OF ROME.	THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.
8. No warrant for adoration of the consecrated elements.	8. No trace of Adoration of the consecrated elements. (Trace of "obeisance" at reception at the close of the 4th Century but no trace during this period of adoration of the consecrated elements in any sense akin to the modern sense of the word).	8. Adoration enjoined: "the worship of latræ which is due to the true God." (<i>Trent, Sess. 13 c. 5.</i>)	8. No adoration is intended by the posture of kneeling at reception, nor ought any adoration to be done. To be so were "idolatory to be abhorred of all faithful Christians."
9. No hint of Reservation.	9. Reserved for the sick and absent—but taken to them immediately after service. Possibly during this period reserved or "stored up" (St. Chrys.) for use when required by the sick. Traces of this towards the close of the period. But Reservation for purposes of adoration quite unknown.	9. Reserved and Adored.	9. No Reservation for any purpose.
10. No hint of Elevation.	10. Trace of Elevation in Syrian Rites, 5th to 8th Century possibly but uncertain. Certainly not for purposes of adoration.	10. Elevated and Adored.	10. No Elevation allowed.

HOLY SCRIPTURE AND THE APOSTOLIC AGE.	THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH (to the end of Sixth Century)	THE CHURCH OF ROME.	THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.
ii. No idea of Communion without communicants.	ii. No idea of Communion without Communicants.	ii. Mass without communicants approved, commended and frequent.	ii. No Communion to be administered without at least three communicants communicating besides the "Priest."
i2. All present at the Lord's Supper partook.	i2. All not intending or not qualified to communicate expressly bidden to depart. Creeping in, however, as a corruption about the 5th century was the practice of what is now called non-communicatory attendance; though scarcely with the same object as in later times.	i2. Masses at which none but the officiating clergy communicate — usually the celebrant alone—approved, commended and frequent.	i2. Non - communicating attendance has "no sanction from the Church of England." (The late Prof. Heurtley.)
i3. Regular Preparation for Reception — Self-Examination Auricular Confession unknown, at least till 4th century.	i3. Regular Preparation for Reception. No trace of Auricular confession.	i3. Auricular Confession part of the Regular Preparation for Reception.	i3. Regular Preparation for Reception — Self-Examination. In case of special difficulty when by self-examination "quiet of conscience" cannot be obtained, consultation with the Minister of God's word recommended. Auricular Confession in the <i>Roman</i> sense unknown.

HOLY SCRIPTURE AND THE APOSTOLIC AGE.	THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH (to the end of Sixth Century)	THE CHURCH OF ROME.	THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.
14. After a meal.	14. Fasting before reception often practised, but not enjoined as absolutely necessary.	14. Fasting before reception the custom.	14. Fasting reception not enjoined. Each communicant left at perfect liberty in this respect.

Most of the points we have considered and enumerated hitherto belong rather to the Negative Side of the Teaching concerning the Lord's Supper, at least as far as concerns the Teaching of the Church of England. We pass now to what from the point of view of the Church of England is the Positive side of the Teaching on the matter before us.

HOLY SCRIPTURE AND THE APOSTOLIC AGE.	THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH (to the end of Sixth Century)	THE CHURCH OF ROME.	THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.
I. LEADING IDEAS.	I. LEADING IDEAS.	I. LEADING IDEAS.	I. LEADING IDEAS.
	<p>1. Remembrance.</p> <p>2. Spiritual Feeding as a means of union with, and participation of Christ by faith.</p>	<p>1. Remembrance.</p> <p>2. Spiritual food. Communion as a means of union with, and participation of Christ by faith.</p>	<p>1. Propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and the dead, availing for their remission of pain or guilt.</p> <p>2. Celestial food, "preserving and supporting spiritual life."</p>
			<p>II. Those who teach only a spiritual feeding are held accursed. There is oral manducation, by all the communicants, of the Body and Blood of Christ — a necessary consequent of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation.</p> <p>II. By faith we are incorporated into Christ and united to the Body of Christ. There is no oral manducation of the Body and Blood of Christ. Christ is fed upon by faith by the soul.</p> <p>II. Faith is the only means of feeding on the Body and Blood of Christ. There is no oral manducation of the Body and Blood of Christ. Christ is fed upon by faith by the soul.</p> <p>II. Faith is the only means of feeding on the Body and Blood of Christ. Those who lack faith are "<i>in no wise</i>" partakers of Christ, but only eat the "sign or sacrament of so great a thing." There is no oral manducation of the Body and Blood of Christ; only a spiritual manducation with the mouth of the soul.</p>

HOLY SCRIPTURE AND THE APOSTOLIC AGE.	THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH (to the end of Sixth Century)	THE CHURCH OF ROME.	THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.
III. Believers eat Christ's flesh and blood not only in the Lord's supper, but at other times also by the exercise of faith. e.g., in Baptism and in various religious exercises, such as reading the scriptures, etc.	III. Believers eat Christ's flesh and blood not only in the Lord's supper, but at other times also by the exercise of faith. e.g., in Baptism and in various religious exercises, such as reading the scriptures, etc.	III. No such Doctrine: in the sense that the eating is in each case of the same nature.	III. Believers eat Christ's Flesh and Blood not only in the Lord's Supper, but at other times also by the exercise of faith. (See Rubric in service for communion of the sick, etc.)
IV. <i>The Qualifications for Reception.</i> It is clearly implied that this feast is for true Christians.	IV. <i>The Qualifications for Reception.</i> No special stress laid on. It is indeed said in the Decrees of Trent that to receive the Body and Blood of Christ both sacramentally and spiritually there must be examination and preparation so as to come in the nuptial garment. That preparation and examination is chiefly the Sacrament of Penance or Auricular Confession as a part of this Sacrament of Penance.	IV. <i>The Qualifications for Reception.</i> I. Baptism (which presupposed Faith.) 2. Repentance. 3. Holiness. 4. Love.	IV. <i>The Qualifications for Reception.</i> I. Repentance. 2. Faith. 3. Stedfast purpose of Amendment of life. 4. Thankfulness for the Death of Christ. 5. Love.

HOLY SCRIPTURE AND THE APOSTOLIC AGE.	THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH. (to the end of Sixth Century)	THE CHURCH OF ROME.	THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.
V. The sign and the thing signified are quite distinct.	V. The sign and the thing signified are quite distinct : although as being symbols, signs, and figures of the Body and Blood of Christ, the Sacramental Bread and Wine are often dignified with the name of that which they signify.	V. The sign becomes completely identified with the thing signified : "the whole substance of the bread is converted into the substance of the Body of Christ our Lord, and the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood." (Trent, Sess., xiii., c. 4.)	V. The sign and the thing signified are kept quite distinct.
VI. The bread is still bread after consecration and the wine still wine.	VI. The nature of bread and wine continues after consecration. No change in the elements beyond a change of efficacy and use.	VI. After consecration no substance of bread or wine remains.	VI. The bread and wine after consecration "remain still in their natural substances." (Black Rubric).
VII.	VII. Thanksgiving a prominent part of the service.	VII. Nothing which quite corresponds.	VII. Thanksgiving a prominent part of the service.
VIII.	VIII. No Prayer for the departed in connection with Lord's Supper, or otherwise.	VIII. Mass specially offered as a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead "to have remission of pain or guilt."	VIII. No Prayer for the Departed : only a Thankful Commemoration of the Faithful Departed in the faith and fear of Christ.

HOLY SCRIPTURE AND THE APOSTOLIC AGE.	THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH (to the end of Sixth Century)	THE CHURCH OF ROME.	THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.
IX. The Lord's supper points forward to the second coming of our Lord.	IX. The Lord's supper points forward to the second coming of our Lord.	IX. No corresponding idea.	IX. The Lord's supper points forward to the second coming of our Lord. It is "a memory of his precious death until His coming again."
X. A reminder of the union of Believers in Christ.	X. A reminder of the union of Believers in Christ.	X. No corresponding idea.	X. A reminder of the union of Believers in Christ; and an assurance of our membership in the mystical body of Christ.
XI. No corresponding idea.	XI. Invocation of the Holy Spirit. (a) to declare (<i>ἀποφήνη</i>) (Liturgy of St. Clem., 4th cent.). (b) to make (<i>τοῦθιν</i>) (Liturgy of Palestine, 4th cent., gathered from Catecheses of St. Cyril, of Jerusalem.) (c) to hallow and make (<i>ἀγιάσειν καὶ ποιήσειν</i>). (Syrian lit. of 5th to 8th cent., gathered from writings of the Fathers.)	XI. No corresponding idea. The prayer in this case is for the "gifts to be carried by the hands of thy Holy Angels to Thine altar on high." (See Canon of the Mass.)	XI. No corresponding idea.

XI.—*continued.*

quoted by Brightman, in
Liturgies East and West,
Vol. i., p. 483, further ex-
plains by the words
“that they may become
to those who worthily
and with faith partake
of the same for remission
of sins, for life everlasting
and for the preservation
of soul and body.” The
Invocation in the Primitive
Church (as evidenced
by this comment of a 7th
cent. writer) was rather
to “add grace, power
and efficacy” to the
elements; not to change
their substance into the
substance of the Body
and Blood of Christ in
any way; a change of
this kind being quite out
of harmony with the
writings of the Fathers
of this period. The only
change that can legiti-
mately be deduced from

HOLY SCRIPTURE AND THE APOSTOLIC AGE.	THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH (to the end of Sixth Century)	THE CHURCH OF ROME.	THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.
	XI.— <i>continued.</i>		
	their writings taken as a whole, is a change of "character, efficacy and use." (See " Goode on the Eucharist.")		
XII.	No such idea.	XII. "Viaticum." The idea appears established by the 5th century.	XII. "Viaticum" prepares for departing a passage to eternal happiness and everlasting glory.
XIII.		XIII. Consumption of any remains of consecrated elements by the clergy and faithful appears to have been the custom in Egypt in 4th and 5th century, and in Byzantine Rites before 7th century: though as seen above Reservation for administration to the sick and absent was also practised.	XIII. Consumption of any remains of consecrated elements by clergy and if necessary some of the communicants ordered Reservation forbidden.

HOLY SCRIPTURE AND THE APOSTOLIC AGE.	THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH (to the end of Sixth Century)	THE CHURCH OF ROME.	THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.
XIV. WHY WAS THE LORD'S SUPPER INSTITUTED? "This do in remembrance of Me."	XIV. WHY WAS THE LORD'S SUPPER INSTITUTED? No explicit answer can be given as in the other cases before us, but from the language of the earliest complete liturgy, i.e., the liturgy of St. Clement, in the Apostolical constitutions and from the language of some of the Fathers, we may safely say that the answer of the Primitive Church if expressed in a formulated sentence would be practically that of the Church of England.	XIV. WHY WAS THE LORD'S SUPPER INSTITUTED? "The Eucharist was instituted by our Lord for two great purposes, to be the celestial food of the soul, preserving and supporting spiritual life, and to give to the Church a perpetual sacrifice, by which sin may be expiated, and our Heavenly Father . . . may be turned from wrath to mercy from the severity of just vengeance to the exercise of benignant clemency." (Catechism of Council of Trent.) In the Decree of Trent "of the Institution" only the "perpetual" sacrifice is maintained as the reason of Institution. The words are: "This the Saviour did that He might leave to His beloved spouse the Church, a visible sacrifice, such as human nature required by which the bloody sacrifice made on the cross might be	XIV. WHY WAS THE LORD'S SUPPER INSTITUTED? "For the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ and of the benefits which we receive thereby." (Catechism.)

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

THE CHURCH OF ROME.
(to the end of Sixth Century)XIV.—*continued.*

represented, the memory thereof preserved to the end of the world and its salutary virtue applied for the remission of those sins which are daily committed by us." (Decree of Trent, Sess. 22, Ch. 1).

NOTE.—The term "Lord's Supper" is used in this column only for purposes of comparison. Rome does not as far as I am aware anywhere make use of this title.

It might perhaps appear that in our consideration of this matter we have included certain points which might be supposed to belong rather to ceremonial than to doctrine, but we have included these points, *e.g.*, vestments, because whatever their origin (and all agree that originally they were not symbolical of any doctrine whatsoever) their long historical association with the doctrine of the Roman Mass makes them in England, at any rate, possessed of a distinctly doctrinal significance, as is frankly admitted by such leaders on that particular side of Church opinion as Lord Halifax and the Rev. Darwell Stone.

We have stated fully in each case the Teaching of Scripture, of the Primitive Church, of the Church of Rome, and of the Church of England concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and we have instituted a detailed comparison between the teaching of the latter (*i.e.*, the Church of England) and the teaching of the three former.

The conclusion we arrive at is this: The Doctrine of the Church of England on the Lord's Supper is diametrically opposed to the Teaching of the Church of Rome. Between the Teaching of the Church of England and the Teaching of the Church of Rome, there is, on this, as indeed on many other subjects, "a line of deep cleavage," a gulf that cannot be bridged.

On the other hand, with the Teaching of the Primitive Church of the First Six Centuries, taken as a whole and viewed collectively, apart from the corruptions in faith and practice which even then were creeping in towards the close of the period, the Church of England is on this subject in substantial agreement.

While with the Teaching of the earliest part of this period, *i.e.*, the Apostolic Age, and with the Teaching of Holy Scripture concerning the Lord's Supper, the

Church of England is in the most complete accord and agreement.

“Magna est veritas et praevalebit.”

Concerning the Teaching of Holy Scripture on the Lord’s Supper, as of its teaching on other points, we may say :

“Verbum Dei in aeternum remanet.”

“See the feast of love is spread,
Drink the wine and break the bread,
Sweet memorials—till the Lord
Call us round His heavenly board,
Some from earth, from glory some,
Severed only till He come.”

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

A 022499

Thynne's Theological Library.

Demy 8vo., 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ by 5 $\frac{1}{2}$. Bound in Divinity Purple Cloth,
with Gold Lettering.

No. 1.

**Archbishop CRANMER ON THE TRUE AND CATHOLIC DOCTRINE
AND USE OF THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.**
With a Preface by the Very Rev. HENRY WACE, D.D., Dean of
Canterbury, and Introductory Notice and Supplementary Notes by
the Rev. C. H. H. WRIGHT, D.D. 3s. 6d. net. Half-calf gold top,
6s. 6d. net.

This work of Archbishop Cranmer, which was the most important of the writings of the great English Reformer, points out the abuses of the Lord's Supper in the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome. It discusses the eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ spoken of in John vi., and shows what is meant by the bread being called His body, and the wine His blood. It proves that the ungodly cannot in anywise be feeders on Christ. It discusses what is the real spiritual food and drink of the soul. It proves that both sacraments were intended to exhibit and confirm our faith in Christ. It explains what was the mystical body of Christ, and the real unity of the Christ as illustrated thereby. It points out simply and plainly the errors of the Romanists, such as Transubstantiation, which subject is treated at large in Book II., which is shown to be opposed to reason and Scripture. It shows that the ancient Fathers taught no such doctrine, and that it is opposed to the earliest teachings of the Catholic Church. A sketch of the opinion of the Fathers is given to show that their views were really opposed to the modern teachings of Rome. The Presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper is similarly examined, and the idea of a "real presence" in the bread and wine shown to be opposed to Scripture and Catholic teaching. The opinions of the Fathers on this great question are lucidly pointed out. A few supplementary notes, confirmatory of Cranmer's views, have been added at the end of the work.

THYNNE'S THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

No. 2.

THE DECALOGUE AND THE LORD'S DAY. Considered on the evidence of Holy Scripture and of the early Christian Fathers. By the Rev. W. B. GALLOWAY, M.A., sometime Vicar of St. Mark's, Regents Park. The obligation of the Fourth Commandment on the obedience of Christians. With copious extracts from the Fathers in the original Hebrew and Greek. 2s. 6d. net. Half-calf gold top, 5s. 6d. net.

SYNOPSIS.—Difference between the giving of the Ten Commandments by God and the subsequent giving of the penal enactments of the law—Super-added laws for the Jews after they had set up the Golden Calf—Scriptural and early Christian authority showing the habit of mind and the custom of God's worshippers from ancient times up to the Fifth Century—Evidence opens up wide fields of thought—Fresh light on passages in St. Paul's Epistles—One-ness of God's purpose in the creation and redemption of the world considered in the change of "Rest-day" from the 7th to the 1st day of the week—Facts stated—Extracts in support from Scripture and the writings of the early Christian Fathers—Heathen, Jewish and Christian ideas—Pliny, Philo, Aristobulus, the Apostolic Constitutions, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, St. Chrysostom, Athanasius, Eusebius, Jerome, and many others referred to, up to the close of the Fifth Century—The Lordship of the Sabbath, the Royal Law. The Fourth Commandment not abrogated by Christ nor any of the Ten.

- Part I. Evidence of Holy Scripture.
" II. Testimony of the Fathers.
" III. Conclusion and Appendix.

No. 3.

THE UNION BETWEEN CHRIST AND HIS PEOPLE. Four Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford by CHARLES A. HEURTLEY, B.D., sometime Fellow of Corpus Christi College and Hon. Canon of Worcester. With Introduction by Rev. F. S. Guy Warman, B.D., Principal of St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead. Demy 8vo, cloth, gilt, 2s. 6d. Half-calf gold top, 5s. 6d. net.

EXTRACT FROM INTRODUCTION.—Canon Heurtley is still remembered in Oxford not only for his learning in the realms of theology and patristic study, but for the kindness and courtesy of his Christian character. It is this combination of learning and courteous kindness in dealing with matters of controversy, which made these sermons so valuable at their first delivery, and which has created a demand that they should be re-printed seventy years afterwards, when too much of our controversy is characterised by the absence of both learning and of courtesy. . . . It is a great pleasure and privilege to me to be allowed to be associated with this re-print. The sermons have been a real help to myself and I trust they may be found helpful to others. May He who is the Truth own and bless them to His own honour and glory and to the edifying of His Church.

- CONTENTS.**—Preface. Sermon I.—The prominence given to the Union between Christ and His people in Scripture; its nature, and the benefits resulting from it.
Sermon II.—How our Union with Christ is begun; how continued.
Sermon III.—Whether our Union with Christ once begun can be dissolved; if dissolved, whether it can be renewed.
Sermon IV.—The Communion of Saints.

THYNNE'S THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

No. 4.

CHURCH LEADERS IN PRIMITIVE TIMES. A Series of Lectures.
with Preface by the Very Rev. Wm. Lefroy, D.D., Dean of Norwich.
Second Edition. Demy 8vo, cloth, gilt, 3s. 6d. net. Half-calf, gold
top, 6s. 6d. net.

CONTENTS.—Ignatius and Polycarp, by Dean Farrar—Aristides, by
Dean Armitage Robinson—Justin Martyr, by Canon Meyrick—
Irenæus, by Preb. Stanley Leathes—Cyprian, by Archdeacon Sinclair
—Chrysostom, by Rev. J. T. Kingsmill—Tertullian, by Rev. G. A.
Schneider—Clement of Alexandria, by the Right Rev. F. H. Chase,
Bishop of Ely—Origen, by Rev. A. E. Brooke—Eusebius, by Rev.
Prof. Gwatkin—Athanasius, by Rev. Prof. Ince—Ambrose, by Bishop
Barry—The Church in the Catacombs, by Rev. Henry Gee—Jerome,
by the Right Rev. T. W. Drury, Bishop of Sodor and Man—Augustine,
by the Right Rev. H. C. G. Moule, Bishop of Durham.

We are very glad to see that this valuable work on Church history has reached a second edition. When first published in 1896 the title was "Lectures in Ecclesiastical History," thus to most of its readers in its present form it will be an entirely new book. The moment when we are lamenting the death of the eloquent Dean, to whose initiative was owing the delivery of these discourses in the grand old nave at Norwich, is a particularly auspicious one, for many will be delighted with an opportunity of reading his own words in the preface. He says: These lectures represent one phase of the work which the modern spirit of England expects the Cathedrals to accomplish. They are not only to be the centre of diocesan devotion, the abiding witness to the world of the power and presence of the Invisible, but also the 'one House of Meeting' for occasional services—Choral, Missionary, Temperance, and so forth." . . . "The subjects of the lectures are 15 in number. They begin with St. Ignatius and Polycarp, and close with St. Augustine. The low price at which this handsome volume is offered should ensure a wide circulation."—*The Record*.

"The 'Fathers' whose remarkable careers are dealt with include Ignatius and Polycarp, Cyprian, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Athanasius, Jerome and Augustine. It will be seen how extensive is the period covered and how wide is the outlook of the authors. The volume is one we can warmly commend, for such a record forms an important link in the evidence of Christianity. Moreover, a perusal of these pages will prove a stimulus to faith and confidence in the Word of the Lord and His dealings with men in all ages.—*The Christian*.

No. 5.

THOMAS SCOTT THE COMMENTATOR. A Memoir of his Life, with some Account of his Principal Writings and an Estimate of his Position and Influence in the Church. By the Rev. A. C. DOWNER, D.D., Oxon, Incumbent of Christ Church, Harrow Road, W., and Chaplain to the Lock Hospital and Rescue Home. With illustrations. Cloth, gilt, 3s. net. Half-calf, cloth sides, gold top, 5s. 6d. net.

SYNOPSIS OF CONTENTS—

- | | | |
|-------|------|--|
| Chap. | I. | Early Life in Lincolnshire ; Schoolboy and Shepherd. |
| " | II. | Change of Plans ; Ordination. |
| " | III. | The Bucks Curacies ; Change of Views. |
| " | IV. | " The Force of Truth." |
| " | V. | Life in London ; Chaplain to the Lock Hospital. |

THYNNE'S THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

- Chap. VI. Three Great Enterprises.
" VII. The Rectory of Aston Sandford : Family and Pupils.
" VIII. Character, Principles, Preaching and Writings ; Scott's Contemporaries and Friends ; His Place in the Church.
" IX. Scott's Family Bible ; a Commentary on the Holy Scriptures.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.—1, Portrait of Thomas Scott ; 2, Summer House, Olney ; 3, Olney Vicarage ; 4, Scott's House in London, No. 2 Chapel Street, S.W. ; 5, The Old Lock Hospital in Grosvenor Place ; 6, The Lock Chapel of Scott's Day.

EXTRACT FROM PREFACE.—" This work is not designed as an exhaustive account of its subject, nor perhaps is such a book called for. . . . The purpose is to seek to bring before the present generation, in the style of the day, the personality and career of a truly great man, not duly honoured in his own time, at least till the closing period of his life, and now in danger of being forgotten."

No. 6.

"**OUR SACRIFICE OF PRAISE AND THANKSGIVING,**" or the Doctrine of the Church of England on the Lord's Supper, compared with Scripture and the Teaching of the Primitive Church, and also with the Teaching of the Church of Rome." By the Rev. P. C. INGROUILLE, B.D., Jesus College, Oxford. Cloth, gilt, 3s. net. Half-calf, cloth sides, gold top, 6s.

CONTENTS—

- Chap. I. The Teaching of Holy Scripture.
" II. The Teaching of the Primitive Church (A), Liturgical ; (B), Patristic. The Teaching of the Fathers of the First Six Centuries.
" III. The Teaching of the Church of Rome and the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent.
" IV. Church of England Teaching on the Lord's Supper.
" V. Sketch of the Stages by which the present Doctrinal Statements of the Church of England on the Lord's Supper have been arrived at.
" VI. The Doctrine of the Church of England as gathered from her authorised Formularies.
" VII. Comparison of the Teaching of Scripture, of the Primitive Church, of the Church of Rome, and of the Church of England.
Concluding Remarks.

EXTRACT FROM PREFACE.—" To-day a large and influential body of men in our beloved Church of England are teaching a doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist, which, as was pointed out by Bishop Jackson, of London, as far back as 1875, differs, but, verbally, if verbally, from Transubstantiation, and of which Bishop Lord Arthur Hervey, of Bath and Wells, said, ' The difference between the doctrine of Transubstantiation and that taught by the new school (i.e. the Ritualists) is absolutely insignificant in the region of religion.' This being the case, it becomes increasingly important that the people of England, and especially every churchman and churchwoman, of all classes and all ages, should know clearly what the doctrine of the Church of England on the Lord's Supper really is, and how closely it agrees with the teaching alike of Scripture and of the Primitive Church, while, on the other hand, it is poles asunder from, and in the most diametrical opposition to the teaching of the Church of Rome."

CHAS. J. THYNNE.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND MANUALS.

Vol. I. CONTENTS.—The Holy Communion, Bishop J. C. Ryle. I do; or, The Good Confession, Rev. A. Kennion. Do You Believe? Rev. R. C. Burr. Ritual in the Light of God's Word, Rev. G. Everard. The Earnest Communicant, Bishop Ashton Oxenden. Evening Communion, Rev. J. J. Beddow. Vestments and the Law, Rev. J. M. Willoughby, D.D. Cloth, gilt, 1s. net.

Vol. II. CONTENTS.—Gleanings from Church History, M. E. Ames. Socialism or Social Reform? Rev. R. C. Burr. Archbishop Cranmer, Rev. Canon McCormick. The XXXIX Articles, Bishop J. C. Ryle. An Address to Young Persons about to be Confirmed, by Bishop Daniel Wilson. The Estimate and Use of Holy Scripture in the Church of England, Dean Wace. Infant Baptism and Regeneration, Rev. L. G. Bomford. Surplice or Special Distinctive Vestment? Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Newcastle. Cloth, gilt, 1s. net.

Separate Numbers One Penny Each.

THE DISCOVERED NEED OF A MEDIATOR; and other topical and Suggestive Sermons. By Rev. SAMUEL DAVIES, D.D., Rector of Dolfor, Montgomeryshire. Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt, 2s. 6d. net.

CONTENTS.—The Discovered Need of a Mediator. The Liturgy of the Church of England. Sad Maternal Love. Repentance, and Works Meet for Repentance. The Holy Spirit. Sowing and Reaping. Spiritual Strength. The Christian Panoply. The Breastplate of Righteousness. Exhortation to Well-Doing. Growth in Grace.

MODERN ROMANISM EXAMINED. By the Rev. H. W. DEARDEN, M.A., with an Introductory Notice by the Rev. Dr. SINKER, Librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge, and a Prefatory Note by the Right Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, D.D., Bishop of Durham. Third Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt, 1s. 6d. net.

A FAITHFUL SOWER. A Memoir of the Life of the Rev. GEO. EVERARD. Edited by his Daughter. With Preface by the Rt. Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, D.D., Bishop of Durham. Portrait. Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt, 1s. 6d. net.

(*For Works by this Author, see complete catalogue.*)

GUIDE TO THE STUDY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. By the Rev. A. R. FAUSSET, D.D., Canon of York. Cloth, 1s. net; paper, 6d. net.

(*For other Works by this author, see complete catalogue.*)

BY DEAN GOODE.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND as to the EFFECTS OF BAPTISM IN THE CASE OF INFANTS. With an Appendix containing the Baptismal Services of Luther and the Nuremberg and Cologne Liturgies. Price 6s. net.

THE NATURE OF CHRIST'S PRESENCE IN THE EUCHARIST; or, the True Doctrine of the Real Presence Vindicated. Two Vols. 8vo, cloth, gilt. Price 7s. 6d. net.

GREAT QUEEN STREET, KINGSWAY.

AN ANSWER TO DR. PUSEY'S CHALLENGE respecting the Doctrines of the "Real Presence," and an examination of the Teaching of the Fathers of the first Eight Centuries. By the late Rev. JOHN HARRISON, D.D. In two vols. 1082 pp. Cloth, gilt, 12s. net.

HEBERT.—UNINSPIRED TEACHING ON THE LORD'S SUPPER from A.D. 74 to 1875. By the late Rev. CHARLES HEBERT, D.D. Two vols. 8vo, LXXII. and 1468 pp., with Chronological Table of Contents, Index of Writers, &c. Cloth, gilt, 7s. 6d. net.

BISHOP J. C. RYLE'S WORKS.

PRINCIPLES FOR CHURCHMEN. A Manual of Positive Statements on Some Subjects of Controversy. Fourth Edition, revised. With the Bishop's Farewell Letter to the Diocese of Liverpool. Price 2s. 6d. net. With gilt edges, 3s. 6d. net.

LIGHT FROM OLD TIMES; or, Protestant Facts and Men. Fourth Edition. Illustrated. Price 2s. 6d. net. With gilt edges, 3s. 6d. net.

CONTENTS.—Introduction for Our Own Days. John Wycliffe. Why were our Reformers Burned? John Rogers, Martyr. John Hooper, Bishop and Martyr. Rowland Taylor, Martyr. Hugh Latimer, Bishop and Martyr. John Bradford, Martyr. Nicholas Ridley, Bishop and Martyr. Samuel Ward. Archbishop Laud. Richard Baxter. William Gurnall. James II. and the Seven Bishops. AND 8 FULL PAGE ILLUSTRATIONS.

HOLINESS; Its Nature, Hindrances, Difficulties, and Roots. With Preface, Introductory Essay, and Supplementary Extracts from Old Writers. Fifth enlarged edition. Price 2s. 6d. net. With gilt edges, 3s. 6d. net.

OLD PATHS. Being Plain Statements on Weighty Matters of Christianity. Fifth Edition. Price 2s. 6d. net. With gilt edges, 3s. 6d. net.

PRACTICAL RELIGION. Plain Papers on the Duties and Privileges of Professing Christians. Sixth Edition. Price 2s. 6d. net. With gilt edges, 3s. 6d. net.

THE CHRISTIAN LEADERS OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. Being an Account of the Life and Ministry of G. Whitefield, J. Wesley, W. Grimshaw, W. Romaine. D. Rowlands, J. Berridge, H. Venn, W. Walker, J. Hervey, Toplady, and Fletcher, together with a sketch of the Condition of Religion in England in the Eighteenth Century. Popular Edition. Price 2s. 6d. net. With gilt edges, 3s. 6d. net.

Each Volume of this Series can also be supplied, bound in half persian morocco, gilt top, 4s. 6d.; half morocco, gilt edges, 6s.; whole morocco, gilt edges, 8s.—all net.

CHAS. J. THYNNE.

THE CHRISTIAN RACE, AND OTHER SERMONS. Setting forth the great Doctrines of Sin, Redemption, Regeneration, and Sanctification, and the Duties of the Christian Life. With Prefatory Note by the Ven. Archdeacon MADDEN, M.A. 8vo. cloth, gilt (cheaper edition), 3s. 6d. net.

PEOPLE'S EDITION OF "KNOTS UNTIED." Crown 8vo, 428 pp. unabridged. Bound in cloth, price 1s. net. Cloth extra, with gilt edges, 2s. net. Half persian, gilt top, 2s. 6d. net. Half morocco, gilt edges, 4s. 6d. net.

HYMNS FOR THE CHURCH ON EARTH. Eighth Enlarged Edition. Containing Four Hundred Hymns, for the most part of Modern Date. Selected and arranged by Bishop RYLE. In large type and on light paper. Crown 8vo, limp cloth, 2s. 6d. net. With gilt edges, 3s. 6d. net. Limp roan, gilt edges, 5s. 6d. net. Morocco, gilt edges, 8s. net.

EXPOSITORY THOUGHTS ON THE GOSPELS. Designed for Family and Private Reading, with Text complete, and Copious Notes. A New and thoroughly Revised Edition, complete in Seven Volumes. Cloth, gilt, 27s. net; half morocco, gilt edges, 38s. 6d. net; whole morocco, gilt edges, 56s. net. Single vols., cloth, 3s. net; half morocco, 5s. 6d. net; and whole morocco, 8s. net.

BISHOPS AND CLERGY OF OTHER DAYS; or, The Lives of Two Reformers (Bishops Hooper and Latimer) and Three Puritans (Samuel Ward, Richard Baxter, and William Gurnall). With Introduction on the Real Merits of the Reformers and Puritans, and a vindication of the Martyrologist Foxe. Crown 8vo, dark blue cloth, gilt, 2s. net.

CHURCH REFORM. Being Papers on the subject, Revised and Enlarged, with full Notes and Introduction. Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt, 1s. 6d. net.

CONTENTS.—Introduction. Our Dioceses and Bishops. Convocation, Cathedral Reform. Public Worship. The Ministerial Office. The Position of the Laity. Practical Conclusions.

The Papers, without Introduction and Notes, limp cloth, 9d. net.

BETHANY. Being Expository Thoughts, with Notes, on the Eleventh Chapter of St. John's Gospel. "The heart of the wise is in the house of mourning" (Eccles. vii. 4). Small 4to, cloth, gilt, 1s. 6d.

(*For Bishop Ryle's smaller works and tracts, see separate list.*)

THE PRAYER-BOOK, ARTICLES AND HOMILIES. Some forgotten facts in their history which may decide their interpretation. With Photo-zincographic Illustrations. By J. T. TOMLINSON. 8vo, cloth, gilt, 5s. net.

LONDON: GREAT QUEEN ST., KINGSWAY, W.C.

Complete Catalogues, Post Free.

BX
5149
C5
I6

Ingrouille, P C
"Our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving";
or, "The doctrine of the Church of England
on the Lord's Supper compared with scripture
and the teaching of the primitive church and
also with the teaching of the Church of Rome."
London, C.J. Thynne, 1909.
20lp. 23cm. (Thynne's Theological library,
no.6)

1. Lord's Supper-- Anglican communion. 2.
Lord's Supper-- History. I. Title.

CCSC/mmb

A022499

